

Prussian Yearbook

Founded by **R. Haym**, continued by
Heinrich v. Treitschke and **Hans Delbrück**

Editor: Dr. Walther Schotte

From the contents:

	Page
Julius Heyderhoff, Karl Twesten	1
Wilhelm Groener, The Liquidation of World War	18
Emil Angerer, Science and Personality	27
Hans Delbrück, Emperor and Chancellor	36
Ernst Sontag, On the preliminary draft of a Judicial Code	46
Friedrich Lohmann, The German Empire	53
Emil Daniels, Czech conception of history	59
Walther Schotte, Russia and Europe	74
Joachim Kühn, A forgotten Baltic poet: Alexander from Sternberg	94
Heinz Amelung, The Story of a Cid Translation	111
Konrad Hentrich, Reform of German Spelling	116

(Continued inside)

Georg Stilke, Berlin
1920

Quarterly 22.50 Mk.

Single issue 8.30 M

Issued on April 8

Reviews

Objectives for the Reich School Conference. Bernhard Kumsteller: On the ministerial decree on history textbooks of December 6, 1919. (p. 126).
Hermann Walsemann: On the critique of the elementary school system. (p. 129).

Pedagogy. Walter Heynen: Deckelmann: 19th-Century Literature in German Education. (p. 134).

Literature. G. Stecher: Werner Mahrholz, German Confessions. (p. 136).

Theatre. Hans Orlowius: Friedrich Hebbel at the Volksbühne. (p. 139). — Kurt Busse: Theatre on Königgrätzerstraße: F. Wedekind, King Nicholas. (p. 145).

History. Walther Schotte: Lives from Franconia. (p. 147). — H. Meisner: Martin Luther. A Portrait of His Life and Work. (p. 149).

Technology. A. Heinze: A. Riedler: Reality-blind people in science and technology. (p. 151).

Political Correspondence

Walther Schotte: March Joys. (p. 154).

Notices and advertisements. (pp. 157—158).

Editor: Dr. Walter Hehnen, Berlin W. 10, Friedrich Wilhelmstraße 10.

Unsolicited manuscripts should be sent to the editorial office, Berlin W. 10, Königin Augustastraße 43, enclosing return postage and registration fee if a return is desired.

Translated by: Ian McGillivray, June 2025.

Translated from: “Preussische Jahrbücher April 1920“.

<https://archive.org/details/preussische-jahrbucher-april-1920>

Footnotes with numerical indicators have been added by the translator.

The recent, very substantial increases in paper prices and printers' wages have again increased production costs by 400%, and by a total of 700% since August 1914.

To our regret the price of our magazine had to be raised again: from April 1st, it will be provisionally 8.30 marks for a single issue and 22.50 marks for a quarterly subscription.

The publisher.

Karl Twesten

His development and his political effectiveness

by Dr. Julius Hehderhoff

In Karl Twesten, Prussian liberalism of the time of the founding of the Reich had its most significant leader; no other man's work is such a vivid and moving expression of the struggles and changes of liberalism in the decade of our first national decision. In this decade, the liberals, organized in the National Association and in the German Progress Party, began their old struggle for freedom and unity of the nation once again and initially attempted to fully implement their liberal demands in the Prussia of the new era, because they expected a liberal Prussia to unify the nation; held down by Bismarck in the constitutional conflict and at the same time paralysed in their fierce resistance by the gradual fulfillment of their national program, they experienced a profound split and transformation after the decision of 1866: The Progressive Party was joined by the National Liberal Party, which no longer fought Bismarck but cooperated with him on the basis of the now incipient balance between the demands of state power and political freedom. German party history knows few events of equal significance. The higher one may rate them, because they deal with once fundamental questions of our state life and a momentous change in political thinking, the more Twesten's personality demands attention.

More than any other liberal, he was at the center of the events of this decade, which precisely encompassed his effectiveness. He expressed the liberal hopes of the new era in a classic way in his first pamphlet. His duel with the head of the military cabinet, Edwin von Manteuffel, was a profound symbol and portent of the rising constitutional conflict. A high point of the conflict lies in his defence of freedom of speech against the threat of its suppression by an infamous ruling by the Supreme Tribunal. If this judge of the good old Prussian type, this man of law and firm legal conviction, appears to be a leading figure of the conflict period, he also belongs to the subsequent period of unification of the previous opponents as a co-founder and outstanding leader of the National Liberal Party, as one of the most important bearers of a new state spirit aimed at uniting power and freedom. What characterizes him is not only the legal sense of the jurist, who seeks firm

norms of state life, guarantees against abuse of the law and administrative arbitrariness, but even more the actual political sense, which strives for what is possible and achievable on the basis of what is given, and sees the eternal task of politics in effective action. It always insists on the recognition of the real; it can never place itself alongside the facts, only in the middle of them. This ability made him superior to the rigid program politicians in the Progressive Party from the very beginning; it enabled him to recognize their incorrect handling of the military question and to acknowledge Bismarck's policy in the battle for Schleswig-Holstein; it drove him to positive action after the decision of 1866.

This sense of reality is one of the most characteristic traits of the family that founded the empire. It is the common experience of a generation whose intellectual development coincided with the victorious advance of the realist movement of the 19th century and who drew the lesson from the collapse of the political ideology of 1848 to "think and want the real". Twesten is a particularly interesting example of this development in terms of intellectual history, as it took place in his case within the simultaneous transformation of philosophical thought and in close connection with Comte's positive philosophy ¹⁾, which he was one of the first in Germany to represent in literature. His political actions can only be fully understood from a knowledge of his intellectual life. For his thinking determined his actions; Hermann Baumgarten's words that we must first master intellectually what we should then attempt in practice also apply to him.

1) Isidore Auguste Marie François Xavier Comte (1798 – 1857) was a French philosopher, mathematician and writer who formulated the doctrine of positivism.

It will be the task of his biography to do justice to the rich and profound content of this little-appreciated life, which reflects an important part of our national development in the 19th century with beautiful clarity. The following attempt may content itself with outlining the course of his development and offering an overview of his political activity, dwelling only on the highlights.

I.

On April 22, 1820, five years after the Wars of Liberation, and half a year after the Carlsbad Resolutions, Karl Twesten's life began in a scholarly house in Kiel. On the heights of German education, one may say, because

Schleiermacher ¹⁾ was his godfather and Niebuhr ²⁾, as his great-uncle, gave him kind wishes for his life. Like Mommsen and Theodor Storm, he is a son of the German Nordmark ³⁾, a native of Schleswig-Holstein by his father and mother. Much in him is reminiscent of the tribal nature: the fact that he returned to his parental home as a mature man and remained permanently at home there is a trait closely related to Storm's Husumerei, but is also explained by his constant sickliness and his singleness; the importance that his parental home and his parents had for him is therefore unusually great; he can only be fully understood as a child of this home. All the characteristic traits of his character are prefigured in the fundamentally different but harmoniously complementary personalities of his parents. From his father, the well-known theologian and successor to Schleiermacher at Berlin University, he inherited his intellectual make-up: An instinct for knowledge and broad educational interests, the need for a coherent view of the world; from his energetic mother, who felt passionately in love and hate and who also followed his political development, he inherited the qualities that made him a man of action, a practical politician.

1) Friedrich Daniel Ernst Schleiermacher (1768 – 1834) was a German Reformed theologian, philosopher, and biblical scholar known for his attempt to reconcile the criticisms of the Enlightenment with traditional Protestant Christianity.

2) Barthold Georg Niebuhr (1776 –1831) was a Danish–German statesman, banker, and historian who became Germany's leading historian of Ancient Rome and a founding father of modern scholarly historiography.

3) Nordmark refers to the North March which initially comprised the northern third of the Marca (roughly corresponding to the modern state of Brandenburg).

The Margraviate of Brandenburg was a major principality of the Holy Roman Empire from 1157 to 1806 that played a pivotal role in the history of Germany and that of Central Europe as core of the Prussian kingdom.

Margrave was originally the title for the military commander assigned to maintain the defence of one of the border provinces of the Holy Roman Empire.

That title came to be borne by rulers of some Imperial principalities until the abolition of the Empire in 1806 (e.g., Margrave of Brandenburg). Thereafter, those domains (originally known as marks or marches, later as margraviates or margravates) were absorbed into larger realms or the titleholders adopted titles indicative of full sovereignty.

He grew up in the transitional period from our literary to our political age, under the full after-effects of the idealistic period, the ideal of humanity and Hegel's philosophy, but at the same time under the impression of the new ideas of political and social reorganization that had gripped Prussia since the accession to power of Friedrich Wilhelm IV. How characteristic of this transitional period and its political poetry are the poems of the Heidelberg student with their fervent worship of freedom and their self-assured demands for a constitution; how appropriate it is to the literary-political double life of the youth of the time that the first publication of the Chamber Court-Assessor is a tragedy from ancient Roman history, in whose declamations the speeches of the United Diet of 1847 resonate! A diary sheet from 1845 takes us inside the mind of this Marquis Posa ¹⁾ disciple: the newly appointed assessor, about to visit the "Christian-monarchical" society with the Minister of Culture Eichhorn, professes his belief in Feuerbach's religion of humanity and in democracy. He, too, has now been gripped by the great conflict of the times, the struggle, initially still quiet, waged in small social circles, between the emerging parties in state and church: the Christian-Germanic and Church-Orthodox here, the liberals and supporters of the free congregations there, a struggle between extremely opposing worldviews. When the pro-light movement then makes this struggle a public cause, fought in the marketplace and pulpit, in meetings, and in the press, he is again involved: he becomes an eloquent champion of the complete independence of civil rights from religious belief, instead of the compulsion to profess a state-recognized doctrine, and thus of the separation of church and state. Of course, in March 1848 he went along with the revolution like Bennigsen and Planck, like Miquel and Bamberger. He defended its legal basis in the Berliner Zeitungshalle ²⁾, the main organ of democracy; he took part in its processions and meetings; he gave speeches in district associations and publicly declared his support for the republic. How could it not have seemed to him at the time to be the ideal form of government; after all, he himself seems to have expected a realm of justice from the implementation of communist ideas. This is also part of the image of the time: such fantastic expectations were widespread among pre-March youth. Where they would have led him is anyone's guess, but it was fortunate for his future that he was now called back to his senses by a better insight. It was his great-aunt Dore Hensler, Niebuhr's girlfriend, who, with her superior knowledge of the world, reproached him for the futility of communist utopias and the falsity of his expectations of the ideal state of the republic, and thus succeeded in making him give up any further pursuit of his views. Politics now fell silent. In the summer of 1849, when the collapse of the Frankfurt

constitutional movement was decided, he was again seen immersed in philosophical problems; in the fall he became a district judge in Wittstock.

1) The Marquis de Posa is a character in Friedrich Schiller's play Don Carlos.

2) The Berliner Zeitungs-Halle communist-leaning evening newspaper was established by Gustav Julius in 1846. More information can be found in the German Wikipedia article "Gustav Julius".

In the following decade, under the rule of reaction, he matured into a man; again, his development is a mirror of the times. While the old conditions were forcibly restored in German political life and every freer movement fell asleep, the great day of science and technology dawned for intellectual and economic life. The ideas of philosophical idealism fade before the tangible results of exact research; the ideas appear to be illusions, while matter gains life. In poetry and the visual arts, in science and worldview, realism becomes the dominant expression of the time; a heightened sense of reality characterizes its creations in all fields. The further course of Twesten's development is also in line with this general movement: unsatisfied with metaphysical systems, the disciple of Feuerbach, the supporter of the victoriously advancing mechanical explanation of natural processes, finds the concluding standpoint of his view of the world in Comte's positive philosophy. Following on from this, he then began a scientific work, a great cultural history. Guided by this new striving for reality, it is intended to "bring all spheres of human life, namely the state and politics, back to the actual ground of intellectual, moral and material conditions and needs" and to search for the "laws" *) by which, according to Comte's teachings, the phenomena of human life are also governed. This memorable attempt at collectivist historiography - the German-universal counterpart to Buckle's English history of civilization ¹⁾ - began as a history of "the societies that have decisively shaped the essential directions of intellectual and material culture": understood in this way, the unfinished work **), which only covers the Asian civilizations and the Egyptians, also has a lasting significance in terms of intellectual history.

*) Letter to Rudolf Haym dated April 8, 1859, see my publication "R. Haym und Karl Twesten. An Exchange of Letters on Positive Philosophy and Progressive Politics." Preuß. Jahrb. Vol. 161, p. 232 ff.

1) "History of Civilization in England" by Henry Thomas Buckle {1821–1862}.

**) Published by M. Lazarus under the title "Die religiösen, politischen und sozialen Ideen der asiatischen Kulturvölker und der Aegypter". Berlin, F. Dümmler, 1872.

One easily senses the significance of devotion to such a work over the course of his life. In addition to his professional work, this universally educated mind has finally found a task worthy of him which claims his full attention. This explains the almost unmissable reading of his Wittstock years. These yellowed collector's notes with their dainty, faded and almost extinguished handwriting seem to belong to the century of polyhistory: silent yet eloquent witnesses to tireless scholarly endeavor in the intellectual desolation and desolation of a small Brandenburg town. After the Berlin city court judge's return to his parents' home, the collecting and excerpting were followed by a summary in a calmly probing, clearly progressive presentation. At times he was gripped by the feeling that he had undertaken too much. Only his leisure hours belonged to this work, and the interruptions were frequent, forced upon him by his constantly fluctuating health. Then the unexpected happened: a liberal turnaround took place in Prussia; the man who had been quietly researching the past, following the habit of his youth, threw a free and decisive word into the political debate on the vital issues of the nation; a dramatic clash with a high-ranking opponent led him from the quiet of his parental home to the heights of political life among the champions of a great party: all their fates, their struggles and transformations in a decisive decade he is now to witness, true to himself, acting and suffering, a figure of lasting impact.

II.

Two pamphlets, unusual in form and content, mark the entry of this clear and far-sighted spirit into politics; both are prominent in the history of German liberalism. The first, "What Matters to Us", is the Liberals' classic programmatic pamphlet at the beginning of the new era, the second, "What Can Still Save Us", their most powerful polemic in a moment of external danger and internal crisis.

In one fell swoop, the new era had changed the situation of the liberals in Prussia. Freed from pressure and persecution, they looked to the future with great expectation. Self-reflection, settling accounts with their opponents and setting new goals were now their primary needs. Twisten's anonymous brochure "What Matters to Us" gave them the most profound answer to these contemporary questions. It summarizes the intellectual movement of the

elapsed decade and transfers it to politics, so that reality, too, can be given its due in politics. That is why it rejects from political theory "the empty declamations and arbitrary constructions from abstract concepts," and that is why it combats, as if it were a practical application of positive philosophy, the "metaphysical phrases" in the liberal camp and the "theological" ones in the conservative camp. It is no coincidence that, on the threshold of the Bismarckian age, it contains the classic formulation of the advancing realist spirit in politics: "We are tired of phrases; in every political question we have a specific, concrete purpose in mind and take our motives from the circumstances and requirements of the existing society"; it is no coincidence that, with this seemingly Bismarckian contempt for the phrase and the pathetic declamation, it expresses the creed of a generation that has succeeded in the difficult work of founding the German state. For this spirit and this success belong inseparably together. The finest charm of the pamphlet lies in the illumination of this new spirit; to express lasting truths in a lasting form is the special art of the author; the strongest and most immediate effect, however, comes from the power of his moral judgment. How sharply he takes issue with the practices of the reactionary Manteuffel-Westphalia Ministry, with its one-sided favouritism for feudal and ecclesiastical interests, with its open contempt for law and order! Against this administrative despotism, he raises the liberals' old demand for the rule of law, he calls for the powers of the government to be legally established and for protection against the arbitrariness of civil servants by independent courts. In this, as in the further demand for a return to constitutionality, fair application of existing laws, and a development of free, independent activity on the permanent basis of law, lie the beginnings of a liberal party program, the basic principles of understanding for the great "Constitutional and Anti-Kreuzzeitung Party," which, in the first months of the new era, united in internal unity almost everyone who participated in political life in Prussia. Heinrich von Treitschke therefore rightly judged that the majority of the Prussian people stood behind these moderate demands; they were "a clear and well considered summary" of their political wishes. This is the historical position of the pamphlet. It lives on in history as a journalistic achievement of lasting value and exemplary high-mindedness; it is one of the finest flowers of the liberal age, like the Easter Proclamation of Grand Duke Frederick I of Baden, which heralded the same change in southern Germany a year later.

But how little were the hopes for a liberal regiment in Prussia to be fulfilled! The ministry of the new era caused the liberals one disappointment after another; two years passed without anything radical happening at home.

But great things were happening in the world: the war of 1859 changed the European system of states. Italy was approaching its unification; Austria, militarily defeated and threatened by the uprising of its nationalities, seemed to be doomed to dissolution; France, certain of its superiority, called for the Rhine frontier. A deep shock ran through Germany; the misery of its fragmentation, its petty states, its powerlessness came nakedly to the surface and cried out for a remedy. The National Association was formed; again there was a demand for centralized power and a German parliament, and again the middle states objected. All the old antagonisms gained new strength; it seemed as if the spring of 1861 would bring the dreaded French attack on the Rhine. What was to be done when at the same time the Italians invaded Venetia and the Danes Holstein, while Austria was fully occupied by the revolution in Hungary and Slavonia? ¹⁾ Was isolated Prussia to suffer the same fate as in 1806, was defenceless Germany once again to come under the foreign rule of Napoleon? The terrible seriousness of these questions was still barely recognized in Prussia, in February Bennigsen could still complain about the indifference of the mood in Berlin, about the narrow-mindedness of its politicians who lived only for their inner worries, and in April Hermann Baumgarten saw the same picture: he too saw Napoleon appearing more and more threatening and feared a second Jena. It was to be an outsider who first spoke out what was needed, who demonstrated the necessity of firm decisions and decisive action both internally and externally in these indecisive and confused times. The pamphlet "What can still save us" fell like the cry of a desperate man into the thunderous atmosphere of these weeks, which was pressing for a release. Its advice against the external danger applies to a situation that has not arisen; the advisability of an alliance with Holland, Belgium, and Switzerland, the states immediately threatened by Napoleon III, the admittedly very uncertain hope of England's help, and the possibility of a voluntary cession of Venice to Italy may therefore be abandoned. What is remarkable, however, is the clarity with which a future leader of liberalism, in his first attempt to survey major politics, assesses the most important questions of Prussia's German policy: that he clearly recognizes the relationship with Austria as rivalry and declares an expansion of power in Germany to be Prussia's unavoidable task; that he fully takes into account the hostility of the middle states; that he does not want to intervene in Hesse-Kassel and Schleswig-Holstein for the sake of popular sympathy, but rather first seeks support from a foreign power that will give Prussia the freedom to act for the nation. In all this, he came very close to Bismarck, but he remained separated from him by the fundamental difference in political outlook: Bismarck's card

in the great game of Germany was Prussian power, while the Liberals' was the full realization of the constitutional state in Prussia. Never has this been justified and demanded in a political work with such captivating conviction, with such confidence in victory, as here, where nothing less than the salvation of the state is expected of it. A great and profound idea, not lacking in historical justification, underlies this demand: that the resumption of the reform legislation of 1807 should prevent a repetition of the disaster of 1806. It was intended to encompass all areas of state life in the unified spirit of liberal reorganization, to break the shackles of the police state and reactionary legislation in municipal and district administration, in schools, and in trade regulations, to awaken independence and self-determination everywhere, and thus to provoke a thoroughgoing internal upsurge that would enable perseverance in the vicissitudes of war better than the one-sided reinforcement of the army. The military reform of William I and Roon was opposed by internal reform, and the liberal conception of the state opposed by the authoritarian one; their inevitable clash, which would culminate in the constitutional conflict, was looming.

1) Slavonia is the Croatian region located on the very north-east of Croatia.

Herein lies the lasting significance of the pamphlet. It leads directly into the prehistory of the conflict, just as it also belongs to the history of the origins of the Progressive Party. A prelude to the conflict is its attack on the House of Lords and the Military Cabinet, so significant in constitutional history. It stems from the conviction that the resistance offered by these bodies, and which was to be expected in the future, to uniform liberal legislation must be resolutely eliminated: it exudes a militant spirit. But the same mood was beginning to grip the country; everywhere people were tired of waiting without results and finally wanted to see action. The old appeasement slogan "Just don't push!", which corresponded so perfectly to the timid reserve of the liberals of the new era, was countered by the ever louder call to "push." The party that has gathered around this slogan, which is also given in the brochure, has included in its program, in addition to a vigorous approach to the national question, the demand raised here to give decisive expression to the will of the liberal majority of the country: the German Progressive Party.

Seeing the author of the brochure among the leaders of this party now seems an obvious expectation. One suspects that the great turning point in his life is imminent. However, it was not he himself who brought it about, but

fate, which placed him in front of the pistol of Edwin von Manteuffel, the head of the military cabinet, whom he described as an "ominous man in an ominous position". This duel, in which Twesten's right arm was shot to pieces, turned him into a political fighter. He appears as a fighter who pays with his person at his first appearance: a clash of arms, symbolically heralding the coming clash between bourgeois-liberal and monarchical-conservative Prussia, precedes his effectiveness.

* * *

The omen would soon come true. With the entry of the Progressive Party into the House of Representatives, the movement began, growing into a storm, spanning the two sessions of 1862 and leading from latent conflict to open conflict at the end of September, and to Bismarck's appointment. As early as March, it brought an end to the ministry of the new era and gave the Progressive Party, which was rapidly gaining ground in the new elections, the dominant position in parliament. Up to this point, Twesten can be seen going with the flow: completely immersed in it, completely filled with the joyful and proud momentum of this victorious advance are the great programmatic proclamations that he wrote to the party at the time, and in the same sense, the address he proposed to the re-elected House of Wilhelm I. puts the fulfillment of his people's desire for freedom at the heart of truly monarchical and conservative politics. However, the more the differences came to a head in the Diet during the deliberations of the Budget Commission on the army budget, the more clearly his point of view, which differed from that of the majority of the party, emerged on this issue, which was now pressing for a decision. While the latter was determined to completely cancel the costs for the reorganization that had already been provisionally approved twice, he wanted the reorganization to be recognized, but only if the two-year term of service was introduced instead of the existing three-year term and if the budget was reduced by around 4½ million thalers. Despite the complete hopelessness of this proposal, which was supported by Heinrich von Sybel and retired General Stavenhagen, he justified and defended it with brilliant eloquence and deep political insight in the great debate from September 11 to 19. It is in this speech that his whole character first comes to the fore: the superiority that his intellectual past, his well-educated sense of reality, gives him becomes visible. He reproaches the majority for having demanded the complete elimination of costs in order to return to the "legal" basis of the 1859 budget. He reproaches the majority for "standing on the ground of a formal principle that disregards real conditions and can never create anything lasting in politics"; he calls it the

first principle for every politician to "reckon with the given conditions". "One says something that is not; one decides what one does not want to have carried out; it is a policy of agitation and demonstration which, in my opinion, makes a prosperous development of our parliamentary relations almost impossible." That is the whole man: this courage to confront his own party is just as characteristic of him as the sharp rejection of all abstract idealism and formal radicalism. The parting of the ways, which was to take place in August 1866, basically already existed here, just as he was in fact already outside the Progressive Party; it managed to exclude him from its executive because of this dissenting stance on the military question. But at first it was only a temporary separation; immediately after the open break with the government and even more so after Bismarck's entry, he acted in agreement with the party again.

For now, it was necessary to stand united against the violent Junker minister, who was now beginning an interpretation and application of the constitution that appeared to the liberals as a return to absolutism. Only in this way, out of their boundless disappointment and out of honest concern for the future of the state, can the excessive bitterness of their attacks on Bismarck, "our insane and frivolous prime minister", as Rudolf Haym called him at the time, be understood; only in this way can one also understand Twesten's unusually declamatory gesture in his declaration against such an attempt at regression: "before we submit to the restoration of absolutism, which is no longer the right and law of this country, sooner will we see the most sacred bonds torn apart; the conviction is general that the attempt at restoration could tear apart the firm fabric of this state." (January 28, 1863.) How these fears were then increased by the simultaneous shift in foreign policy, which led Prussia through the Alvensleben Convention to the side of Russia and led to a joint assistance against the Polish uprising! In the English House of Commons and the French Senate, the convention was the subject of fierce attacks on Prussia; the people's own representatives were denied any precise information about it. This was the situation in which Bismarck and the opposition fought each other with the old slogans of the policy of the Holy Alliance and the solidarity of the European revolution, Simson compared the minister to a tightrope walker, Twesten spoke of an adjutant policy and declared, to rapturous applause from the House, that the honour of the current government was no longer the honour of the state and the country. But, as incisive as his forms of attack and defence became, he, the moderate one, was not comfortable with this development. "What good is it to see things coming and talk about them; we are just as powerless in the face of foreign affairs and the

decisions of the government in general, despite the constitution and parliament, as those who recognized the impending catastrophe in 1806. We will have to go through the horse remedy, be it this year or next. This cure did come; but that it would lead to the healing of Prussia under Bismarck's ingenious hands could not yet be foreseen at that time in the stage of increasing inner illness. It was obvious that the field belonged to the radicals, and Twesten acted only logically when he now let them take the lead. "If it were not to keep a hand in the game for future times, one could of course resign now without regret. Against the current government, the nature of the opposition is quite irrelevant. The first loudmouth who comes along achieves just as much as a political mind." (Sept. 27, 1863.) So resigned is he even before the beginning of the second session of the conflict period.

Then the looming decisive battle for the German Nordmark revived his hopes of a turnaround in Prussia. The stormy negotiations in the state parliament showed him once again in complete opposition to the progressive left around Waldeck: while the latter declared that Prussia could do nothing, since the constitutional conflict precluded any grant of money to the government, he placed the national demand above all other considerations: no conflict within a state and no conflict between the various states of Germany should be allowed to play a role in the question of Germany's integrity. Prussia should intervene to protect it, detaching itself from the Treaty of London and at the same time recognizing the right of succession of the Duke of Augustenburg. Duke of Augustenburg, not together with Austria, but at the head of the middle states, which went with the national current in this question and stood up for the right of succession of the Augustenburgs. However, Prussia did not take the path passionately demanded by the nation, but rather the opposite one prescribed by Bismarck's Prussian ambition and Prussian sense of great power: the path of strict compliance with the Treaty of London, whereby England and France lost the possibility of interference, and the joint war of the great German powers, in which Prussia pulled Austria behind it and achieved the complete liberation of Schleswig-Holstein. Twesten accompanied this development with grave concern: in its beginnings he had hoped for the fall of Bismarck, and now the hated man stood firmer than ever; more than once he had feared the worst for Germany, when the result was a national success beyond all expectation. His decision to "unconditionally recognize the foreign success, not only the liberation of the duchies, but also Prussia's position through the war on its own initiative, regardless of England's cries and threats" (August 23, 1864.) He did so in the Schleswig-Holstein debate of the Landtag of 1865, to the grumbling of his own party; at the same time, he

tried to push through Michaelis' motion, which wanted to allow the duchies to be constituted only "in indissoluble union with Prussia". Without success, of course. How he was then reviled by the entire democracy as a particularist and denier of the people's right when his letter to the 36 committee of the National Association clearly stated that the right of the Prussian demands, justified by the nation's power interests, was higher than the absolute right of self-determination of the people of Schleswig-Holstein. In truth, this letter, like Mommsen's concurring declaration, was a clarifying, liberating act; for the far-sighted, it already revealed the possibility of a union between Bismarck and a liberalism that thought in terms of *realpolitik*.

It so happened that the most visible bearer of this coming rapprochement, through the strength of his sense of justice, came into the sharpest opposition to Bismarck's internal policy, which was to widen the conflict and once again reach a climax of bitterness. It had arisen as a military and constitutional conflict; it became a judicial conflict when Twesten, in the chamber speech of May 20, 1865, accused the Minister of Justice, Count zur Lippe, of "systematic corruption" of the Supreme Tribunal and called the decisions of this court the unadulterated expression of the conservative party orientation. The government's response was to attempt to abolish the constitutionally guaranteed freedom of speech of members of parliament through the decision of the Supreme Tribunal on January 29, 1866, on the meaning of Article 84. The entire liberal opposition immediately rose up against this and, in two days of stormy proceedings, rejected this decision, which was intended to enable the prosecution of Twesten, as an encroachment on the rights of the House. The highlight of the memorable debate (February 9 and 10, 1866) was Twesten's speech on his own behalf. Never has he spoken more passionately and captivately; no speaker has criticized the ominous way in which the resolution, which was an attack on a fundamental constitutional right, was created by the vote of two assistants "of a reliable disposition", its content and its probable consequences with equal devastating force. In all its force and sharpness, with its undisguised threat of revolution, this great speech of attack and defence is one of the most vivid documents of the time of the conflict; Gustav Freytag's simultaneous judgment that the conflict had turned from a battle over the army into a battle over "the entire moral foundations of civil life" applies to it. It is certain that they were dangerously shaken, but it is also certain that the Progressive Party considered Prussia's internal illness to be more serious than it was. Despite such signs of decomposition, the power organization of the old Prussian authoritarian state maintained its old firmness.

The unsuspected strength it possessed was to prove itself in the great war test of the summer of 1866.

The moment had come when Bismarck's daring boldness against the co-rule of Austria in Germany called for the decision of arms in order to realize the national goal of the liberals, the small German unification under Prussia, by means of armed great power politics. From the Prussian Junker and absolutist, whom they once again opposed, rose the German statesman, who now issued their old slogan, a German parliament with universal suffrage, and thus shook their ranks anew. In the crisis that now began, Twesten initially opposed Bismarck's war policy with the entire Progress Party, but then, when he recognized the inevitability of war, he advocated the approval of the war funds on the sole condition that the right of the state parliament's authorization be recognized by the government. In a meeting with Bismarck (May 29, 1866), he suggested that this recognition be solemnly and bindingly pronounced in a royal speech from the throne. The adoption of his corresponding draft, which was approved by Bismarck, failed due to Wilhelm I's personal objection. Without a settlement of the conflict, the war began, the victorious outcome of which also decided the defeat of the Progressive Party. Defeated in the internal struggle, abandoned by the majority of voters under the impression of the external victory, it crossed over into the new Germany created by Bismarck. When the victor now met it with indemnity, its long-planned split was completed. Twesten was one of the first to leave the Progressive Party; in August and September 1866, the new faction of the National Party formed around him and Michaelis, Lasker and Forckenbeck, which then united with the liberals from the annexed provinces and the small North German states to form the National Liberal Party before the convening of the constituent Reichstag of the North German Confederation.

These events were the most important turning point in Twesten's political life. It will always remain his historical merit that he effectively helped to lead liberalism to the side of Bismarck at a decisive moment, from unfruitful opposition to positive cooperation in the constitutional development of the unity founded by the Woffen. Because it took Bismarck's hand, the immediate future belonged to the National Liberal Party. But she did not want to support him in unconditional succession, not only willingly and generously making sacrifices for the power she also longed for for the nation, which had now established the old Prussian military monarchy, but at the same time to secure and increase the nation's still-contested civil liberties. The difficulty of this task, the limits that Bismarck's need for power placed on the co-determination

of the new Reichstag, was to be felt more painfully by none of the founders and first leaders of the party than Twesten, the leader of the Left.

It was his natural position. He now embodied the Progressive Party in the National Liberal Party. In all matters of constitutional law, he remained true to his progressive past. He ensured that the founding program of the new party reiterated the entirety of the liberal demands of 1861; at the same time, he reiterated what he saw as the indispensable condition for cooperation between government and popular representatives and for the prevention of new conflicts. He saw it in an "administration that complies with the law and inviolably respects the rights and freedom of individual citizens and the community as a whole," and he added that relapses into other past practices must be resolutely opposed at all costs. From this language, which is so characteristic of him, one can already deduce the new conflicts that this fighter, steeped in experience of conflict, was facing. With wisdom and firmness, he had promoted the constitutional work of the North German Reichstag, carried a heavy workload as a reporter on the electoral law and the constitution, and even interacted personally with Bismarck, whom he supported. Then, in November 1867, an undoubted relapse of the kind just mentioned would involve him in a budget conflict with Bismarck and forever sever the barely established bond between the two. The details do not belong here. The unauthorized and unlawful use of a loan granted to the government for other purposes to compensate the princes who had been deposed in 1866 was at the heart of the matter. Twesten was quite himself when he called this action of the government a breach of trust and of the law, which Bismarck felt was an attack on his personal honour; he was even more so when, as a man of facts and reality, he approved the use of the money for political reasons, but at the same time emphasized that by such a procedure the government was making it impossible for itself to be on good terms with all those who were interested in stable legal and constitutional conditions. It was the old, constantly held basic demand of his political life, for which he stood up unbendingly and tirelessly. It was precisely here, however, that he clashed with Bismarck's autocratic master nature. One may lament it or disregard it, but one cannot deny it: because of his personality, his sense of power and his need for power, the constitutional ideal of Twesten, Lasker and Gneist, the omnipotence of the district judge, which he ridiculed and who wanted to be in demand everywhere as a "constitutional family doctor", found firm limits to its realization; only through him could the central constitutional demand of the Liberals, the responsible Federal Ministry, have been implemented. Twesten

defended a motion aimed at this in his last speech (April 16, 1869); this parliamentary conclusion is harmonious, entirely in keeping with his nature.

His personal fate, however, was bitter and sad. His courageous stand against the High Tribunal's bending of the law in matters of parliamentary freedom of speech was to make him the victim of the most vicious judicial persecution. He experienced most acutely in himself the lack of adaptation to the spirit of the constitutional state, which he rightly accused the Prussian bureaucracy of, while fully acknowledging its historic achievements. *) The unanimous protest of the party in the state parliament certainly helped him, and he certainly had the satisfaction that Bennigsen and Forkenbeck secured the dismissal of the reactionary Minister of Justice Lippe, who was leading the persecution against him, but the trials continued and ended with his conviction in April 1868, whereupon he voluntarily left the civil service. This injustice had no influence on his political conduct. But his fragile health was no longer able to cope with the accumulated excitement, restless work and constant mental strain of such eventful years. In April 1869 he collapsed. A long infirmity followed, interrupted by occasional flickers of strength, illuminated at last by the glow of the victorious approaching unity. On October 14, 1870, in his parents' home, under the eyes of his aged parents, his life of struggle expired.

*) In his historical-political study *Ueber den preußischen Beamtenstaat* (About the Prussian civil service-state) (Preuß. Jahrb. 1866, November and December).

What this Prussian liberal means to historical contemplation has already been outlined in the introduction. The fact that his personality and his effectiveness have a general significance for our national life, and that this significance can perhaps only now, after the collapse of an excessive militaristic power politics, be properly recognized, will no longer be explained here, but merely stated. Today, Germany has achieved what he wished for it before the decision of 1866: the questions of power and freedom are no longer separate, they are in one hand, in the hands of the people. Germany has today achieved what he wished for it before the decision of 1866: the questions of power and freedom are no longer separate; they lie in one, in the hands of the people. Whether it is ripe for the cultivation of these lofty values, whether it proves itself worthy of the freedom it has won, whether it can regain the power essential to its self-respect — these, among others, will be the decisive questions of our future. Those who delve into them will remember him. For he

demonstrated in an exemplary manner how one can do justice to both and reconcile their conflicts: through the union of the highest civic courage in the struggle for freedom with profound political insight into the nature and demands of power.

* * *

The liquidation of the world war

Review and outlook

by General Groener

9. Armies of Millions and Technology.

The "latent war", which hovered between France and Germany even after the end of the 1870/71 campaign, gave direction and speed to the development of armaments in Europe and beyond to the Far East. As early as 1909, Count Schlieffen said that the "conceivable" had been achieved in the competition of weapons technology; it would be useless to increase the requirements any further. The World War gave us gas weapons in various forms, masterpieces of cannons that fired at 100 kilometers and more, and many other things. The old Schlieffen would have shaken his head at this; they were of no use to us, nor was the entirety of trench warfare, which led technology in directions that did not correspond to the true nature of armies of millions. The problem was not to invent new and ingenious means of destruction, but to find a way to avoid destruction ourselves. In Count Schlieffen's opinion, the triumphs of weaponry could not be expected to make the battle any easier or to give him superiority over his opponent. "By distributing its precious gifts equally and impartially among all, it caused everyone the greatest difficulties and brought them the most considerable disadvantages." The trench warfare gave a fatal spur to the competition of technology to create new, more effective tools of destruction. As a result, warfare increasingly took on the character of brutal combat, in which the real genius of the commander did not come into its own and the power of matter came to dominate. Despite all the efforts of inventive minds and despite the highly increased achievements of industry, superiority over the mass technology of the whole world could never be won under the sign of technical thought. Our efficiency was impaired from the outset by the fact that we were behind in the manufacturing methods for the mass production of weapons and war equipment. Moreover, as the war dragged on, the technical competition created new and difficult problems, such as shortages of coal and labour.

Of course, technology is inextricably linked to armies of millions; without steam and electricity, armies of millions could neither be raised and maintained nor deployed. Only the enormous technical advances of the last

decades of the 19th century made warfare with mass armies possible. Whether this constitutes a cultural advance has become doubtful to some after the experiences of the World War. It was believed that mass deployment would end the war more quickly and thus reduce the destruction of cultural values. The opposite happened. This, however, was not due to the nature of armies of millions per se, but rather to their misuse, for standstills and prolonged operations contradict the true nature of the masses in war, which lies in movement. Years of trench warfare also contradicted the natural conditions of the country and its people in the Theatre of war and placed an excessive burden on our economy, under which it collapsed. Seven- or thirty-year wars can no longer be fought with armies of millions, as the world's production of goods is insufficient, and the billions of dollars in costs cannot be met. The admirable, tremendous achievement over four years has indeed put our entire economic existence at risk and also called into question whether the procreative power of the people is still sufficient to make up for the loss caused by the war.

It has already been earlier mentioned that victory lies in movement. The most important task, one that only technology was capable of solving, was to ensure that the army's mobility was not lost, but rather to maximize it. The railroads formed the movement apparatus of the masses. The brilliant course of mobilization and deployment is due to the years of comprehensive preparation of the railroads for these tasks. The work carried out in the railroad department of the Grand General Staff was based on the correct understanding of warfare with armies of millions. During the war itself, the railroads often moved the masses according to operational and tactical intentions under very difficult conditions. It can be said that the special feature of modern warfare can be seen in the railroad operations; the tactical deployment of troops in defensive battles was also based primarily on the achievements of the railways. The specific nature of operations and transport was not universally understood; command and staging authorities were easily inclined to intervene in areas of activity beyond their control, whose elements were alien to them. If the war of movement had continued, the railroads could still have achieved quite significant things; they had been trained through studies and war games in peacetime to meet all operational requirements. The railroads are in fact nothing more than marching roads on which the columns can turn just as easily as on the country roads, provided that the rail network is suitably developed. Two considerations must be taken into account, however: first, that not every lower authority assumes that the railroads are only there for them and their needs; and second, that not every higher authority believes it

understands how to operate the technical apparatus, which can be commanded to perform at will. Operational intentions based on inadequate railroad connections have no chance of success from the outset. As a result, the military ventures in Asia Minor were doomed to failure. The railroad network in Germany was generally adequate for the anticipated operational requirements in a two-front war; however, the efficiency of the eastern network lagged considerably behind that of the western one. Locomotives and wagons were plentiful; there was no shortage of operating personnel, even for the commissioning of enemy railroads. The Austro-Hungarian railroads were not sufficiently developed, especially in the Theatre of war, and were considerably less efficient than the German ones; there were not enough locomotives and wagons. The railroad network in Belgium and northern France, the commissioning of which was a generally recognized achievement, offered every prospect for the smooth conduct of operations; fortunately, the enemy had only destroyed the railroads to such an extent that restoration would not encounter insurmountable difficulties. The achievements of our railroad troops, who in peacetime had never been confronted with such tasks as they were confronted with during the war, are therefore to be particularly praised. The Russian railways, due to their different track gauge, presented certain difficulties for commissioning, but these were overcome, although, of course, they required a longer time and more manpower than in the Western Theatre of War. The operational movement of troops in the eastern Theatre of war was made more difficult by the fact that the Russian railroad network was not a close-knit one and lacked cross-connections in particular; detours were therefore often necessary. The closer to the German railroad network the major operations could take place, the more favorable was the operational use of the troops by means of the railroads; a deep penetration into Russia was less favorable from this point of view. With the increasing duration of the war and the transition to positional warfare, a generous expansion of the railroad network became necessary in all Theatres of war. Large and important mainline connections were established and the network in the operational area was supplemented by extensive small-gauge and field railway constructions; an efficient system of unloading and reloading had to be created. All these tasks required a large army of operating, construction and labour personnel as well as an enormous amount of operating and construction materials, the manufacture of which at home and in the Theatres of war placed a considerable burden on our production. It was also necessary to call in civilian construction companies to the Theatres of war; their achievements were a credit to German engineering. Particularly noteworthy is the speed with which

large civil engineering structures were built, which was unimaginable in peacetime, with railroad troops and companies competing with each other. Mighty buildings will bear witness to the cultural achievements of the German barbarians during the war, even to future generations in enemy territory.

At the beginning of the war, the railroad operations were in excellent condition. The peacetime training of the personnel and their education to selfless fulfillment of duty continued for years. However, when from 1917 onwards the war began to exceed our strength in terms of its extent and demands, it was not surprising that the railroads were also run down. Nevertheless, it should be emphasized that they performed as well as humanly possible until the end of the war and only later fell into disrepair.

If the railways stop running, warfare will stop of its own accord; that is something that those who talk about war as a game that can be started and ended at will, as the mood requires, should take note of.

The railroad advance in the Ukraine in 1918 was of particular attraction, which in its varied manifestations gave much pleasure to leaders and troops and showed that one is able to dominate a vast country through the possession of railroads.

Trucks were a valuable addition to the railroads for supplying the army and for transporting reserves over shorter distances. Their great importance for the use of the masses had been recognized early on, but all kinds of peace concerns hindered the organic integration and widespread use of the new means of transport. Special organizations, which were created with preference outside the overall organism of the million-strong army, carried with them the not to be underestimated danger that, in the event of the outbreak of war, it would take a long time, especially during the period of decisive operations, until the frictions of integration into the overall organism were overcome. General knowledge about the use of resources also suffered from the special situation. This was the case not only with trucks, but also with airplanes and other equipment, especially communications equipment.

For Count Schlieffen's Kannä operation ¹⁾, the planned use of trucks to supply the battalion square on the right wing was particularly necessary, as the advance of two or three army corps in succession on the same road was planned. The supply of such a long column had been studied in detail in theory during peacetime; these studies were not put to practical use because the deep division of the right wing of the army, which Count Schlieffen had established

as an absolute requirement of the operational concept, was dispensed with in the mad rush of the troops and in the race for the laurels of victory.

1) The Kannä operation, also known as the Schlieffen Plan, which aimed to swiftly defeat France through a rapid attack through Belgium and the Netherlands.

As the war progressed, the shortage of trucks and supplies became increasingly noticeable, especially when, from 1917 onwards, the horse-drawn vehicles fell into a desolate state due to a lack of fodder. Our resources were everywhere too limited for the enormous demands of continuous trench warfare and the loss of all sea supplies. Even the commissioning of the conquered Romanian oil wells could not remedy the fuel shortage. Moreover, in the second half of the war, the technical requirements increased immeasurably.

The development of communications equipment for commanding a multi-million-strong army actually only began during trench warfare. On the one hand, the stationary nature of the battle facilitated operations, on the other hand, construction and maintenance consumed enormous amounts of material and constantly required an army of manpower, so that the intelligence formations ultimately suffered from dangerous hypertrophy, a common affliction of the multi-million-strong army in trench warfare in general, as the ratio of actual combatants with weapons to soldiers performing other tasks became highly unfavorable for the conduct of combat, both defensively and offensively. The abundance of men also made the enemy's task easier in this respect.

The lack of a well-organized communications and command transmission service was of particular importance for the course of the major operation in 1914. Count Schlieffen wrote about the technical command of the army: "No Napoleon, surrounded by a brilliant entourage, stands on high ground. The commander is further back, in a house with spacious writing rooms, where wire and radio telegraph, telephones and signalling apparatus are at hand, crowds of motor cars and motorcycles, equipped for the longest journeys, await orders. There, on a comfortable chair, in front of a wide table, the modern Alexander has the entire battlefield in front of him on a map, from there he telephones his rousing words, and there he receives the reports." When the advance through Belgium began in August 1914, the battlefield soon stretched from Flanders to the Vosges. The commander was far back, sitting in a comfortable chair in front of a wide table; to this extent, the advice of Count

Schlieffen had been followed. But the information about the enemy, which served as the basis for the commander's orders, did not reach him with the speed and clarity needed to gain a true picture of the situation. Technical contacts were insufficient to clarify doubts through rapid inquiries and to be informed about the enemy's movements. The impressions of the foremost troops about the behavior and condition of the enemy took on a color that differed greatly from reality during the long march, which gave the commander a false impression of the course of the operations. Since the required skepticism towards the reports of victory was not exercised, the reins of leadership soon seemed to drag on the ground, while the general believed he must not overstep the reins of victorious armies and assumed that the armies were well on their way to inflicting a crushing defeat on the French. The inadequate technical communication between the general and the fighting troops, and the distortion of the true picture of the enemy during the long chain of commands, are largely responsible for the fact that the great operation ended in complete failure. With some foresight, how easy it would have been for technology, through advanced intelligence and command posts of the Supreme Command, and through numerous observation and liaison officers with motor vehicles and aircraft, to ensure that the modern Alexander found, far back on his map, a picture of the situation that was generally accurate. For the execution of the great operation and the consolidation of the operational idea depended less on the details of the battle at this or that point, than on ensuring that one did not allow oneself to be deceived about the enemy's movements within the framework of the whole. This was not a case of "central battle command" by telephone and other technical means, as later developed in trench warfare for defensive battles, but rather the basis for certain operational decisions, which were nevertheless decisive for overall success. The "power of the telegraphic word of command", which the old Moltke had already practiced in an exemplary manner in 1866 and 1870/71 and which could have been applied to a much greater extent in 1914 thanks to the further development of communications, was in fact not exercised at the beginning of the war; arrangements between armies cannot be avoided for very specific combat purposes of a temporary duration; however, in order to carry out a large, unified operation involving seven armies, a firm hand and the clear word of command from the commander are required.

Trench warfare made the telephone the ruler of command and control; despite many disadvantages, this could not be avoided. With the long duration of this state of affairs, the communication of news and orders took on a highly bureaucratic character. The habits of daily service increasingly supplanted

independent leadership activity. The general staff became the pronounced bearer of habitual communication; the originality of the character of the individual leader as well as of his assistants was sidelined by the technical perfection of the means of communication; with the help of the telephone, the higher authorities showed the greatest interest in the details of battle command and daily service, the less they could be occupied with operational considerations and other questions of higher troop command. The independence of judgment was impaired by constant telephone communication, all the more so because it is inherently susceptible to misunderstanding, and the spoken word in routine communication is not connected with the sharpness of thought as in the responsible writing of a message or an order. Excessive telephone traffic often gave the service a nervous character. The best qualities of our peacetime training of commanders and their assistants, independence of judgment and independence of action, have been squeezed into Spanish boots by trench warfare.

The electric wave did not always carry "sparkling" words to the fronts; premature judgments and errors were also caused by the long-distance communication from mouth to mouth. Napoleon's white horse was no longer in place to shout words of encouragement to the troops. Sharing life with the common soldier was the leader's only way in trench warfare to find the way to the man's heart.

The dirigibles did not live up to expectations. At the beginning of the war, when they might have been able to contribute to the reconnaissance of enemy movements, their numbers and above all their performance were not sufficient. In the new tasks that were assigned to them later on, the "power" took a back seat to the "disadvantages" despite the considerably increased performance; even the larger number was not enough to be effective, and soon the defence proved to be far superior to the fragile nature of the weapon. The giant ships, of whose importance as tools of war not only the old Zeppelin, but the whole nation had wonderful ideas, disappeared more and more from the air, whose rulers became the airplanes. These proved to be indispensable organic links in the armies of millions and made significant contributions not only to reconnaissance but also to infantry combat. In trench warfare, they became the most important means of reconnaissance for the high command as well as for infantry and artillery combat. The special requisite of the aviator was the photographic apparatus, in whose use great perfection was achieved. At the beginning of the war, we were still quite carefree about the airmen; we thought nothing of night flights and allowed ourselves to be surprised by the enemy.

We were behind France from the outset in the organization and use of airplanes, England soon took up aviation with vigour and further increased the enemy's lead. Our later intensified efforts to catch up with the enemy through a large organizational and construction program failed to achieve our goal; due to the exhaustion of our economic and personnel forces, we were also condemned to a minority of numbers in this area and could only seek success in outstanding individual achievements, which earned our airmen much fame and honour, but could not prevent the enemy airman from becoming more and more the master of the infantry battle, not to mention the constant disturbance of the troops in the combat area.

The Big Berthas had been designed and deployed to break concrete and armour in the course of the competition between gun and tank. This seemed to give the gun superiority over the fortress. In fact, the Berthas also succeeded in quickly clearing up some fortresses that were considered very strong. Later, however, they proved inadequate against the French eastern front, which had been generously expanded during peacetime. Our artillery equipment and training were not up to the demands of trench warfare; it took a lot of time, effort and work to improve our artillery performance so that we were more or less equal to the varied combat tasks. Our artillery had to undergo a permanent reorganization in response to necessity, whereby significant organizational achievements were certainly made, but its use suffered. The superiority we had in mobile warfare with our heavy artillery at the beginning of the war was of little use to us in trench warfare, since this soon presented new challenges that could only be solved by long-range guns, not by our howitzers and mortars. Although we later achieved a record performance in terms of firing range, this caused quite a stir without meeting expectations in terms of effectiveness.

It is generally known that a serious ammunition crisis occurred in the fall of 1914 because the peacetime preparations for the supply of ammunition had fallen far short of the actual requirements of the war. Foresight was not in itself our strong point, but in this case the General Staff had made higher demands which had not been met. However, we were helped through the crisis by the gray cast iron grenade, a rather inferior product, but one that could be produced quickly. Fortunately, the enemy did not have large quantities of ammunition at that time. Even in 1915, no decision was made to implement a far-reaching weapons and ammunition program because the hope for an early end to the war, even though the conditions for it no longer existed, was clinging to false optimism. Only the experiences of 1916 opened our eyes to the fact that the battle could obviously no longer be brought to an end by the

spirit of the leadership, but by the mass of matter. Not only technology as such, but rather mass production in the system of division of labour had risen to dominate the battlefield. Before Verdun and on the Somme, matter already seemed to have won the final victory. The brief glimmering of the spirit in the Romanian campaign and on a few other occasions was soon followed by the renewed tremendous pressure of supply, which weighed on us until the very end of the war and to which we inevitably succumbed over time. Trench warfare had given matter this power over us; mind and will are inferior in the battle against the masses. Aware of this mighty danger threatening us, Count Schlieffen had raised the spirit and will of warfare to the highest level in his Kannä-Operation.

* * *

The aim was to put technology at the service of the implementation of the plan; it was capable and ready to do so. Where inhibitions arose in 1914, it was not in the technology, but in the inadequate application of its means by the leadership. In peacetime we had not studied the relationship of technology to mass armies in sufficient detail, otherwise we should have foreseen the enormous danger we faced in the transition to trench warfare. The enormous demands of technology in trench warfare over fronts of hundreds and thousands of kilometers length were a major cause of the overstretching of our economic capacity. Conducting mobile war to the end and thereby conserving our production power as much as possible was the task whose solution was to be found in Schlieffen's plan.

* * *

Science and personality

by Dr. Emil Ungerer

"The word 'science' is ridiculously fetishized these days. It is therefore appropriate to point out that science is nothing other than the sum of the opinions of the researchers alive today." Thus begins a book by J. V. Uexküll, a respected natural scientist of our time. Mustn't these words, like a warning cry, startle every scientist who hears them for the first time from their secure calm—at least every scientist who is one from the heart, who simply follows his tasks and believes in the necessity of his actions? Mustn't every seeker fear for the sanctity and meaning of his goal?

In particular, of course, many have already been driven to similar thoughts, most frequently in those frontier areas where science asserts its rights in active life. If, in its name, the sick person is given this powder, this potion, or this ointment today, and that tomorrow, that powder, that potion, or that ointment; if he was previously treated with cold, now with heat, when the pig population of a country is sacrificed today to the demands of "science", which it orders to be restored tomorrow, then the thought of the ridiculous fetishism with the word "science" is quite obvious.

But it is not this premature utilization of still uncertain results, the provisional nature of which the calmly weighing researcher is aware of, but the right of the scientist to ever regard results as definitive, to ever advance to knowledge via "opinions", that are called into question by that word. A few lines later, the question: "What is scientific truth?" finds the abject answer: "An error of today."

Must not the weight of this anxious doubt be increased by the concern that imposes itself on every calm observer of our restless scientific enterprise, that all the bustle is only going into the breadth, not into the depth? Shouldn't anyone who sees the questions and answers of science dominated by fashions, like the changing of women's clothes, fear that a stronger change in fashion could cause all the dazzling discoveries and daily successes to be forgotten and replaced by others that would then be more attractive, more "contemporary"? Simply replace them without giving the edifice of science stronger and deeper foundations, mightier storeys, prouder towers and battlements!

This is not intended to raise the age-old question of the limits of our knowledge, of the ability of the human mind to fathom reality. Rather, a brief reflection is intended to determine what science is and how science is created. If, despite our awareness of the finite nature of our achievements and the infinite nature of the task, the result gives us the right to work on the expansion of science with hope in the face of all doubt, it will also show us which almost hidden impulses in today's scientific life must become strong and great so that those worries about its success become void.

An increasingly clear picture of the structure of the sciences, their organization and internal coherence, their basic concepts and procedures, is emerging today. This picture is being worked on both through general considerations within the individual specialized sciences and through the expansion of the old logic in philosophy. It is a picture whose presentation has increasingly become the concern of a special "logic of the sciences," "science of knowledge," or (best and most general) "theory of order." It shows us the directions in which the urge to want to know moves and the forms that knowledge takes; it must answer our first question of what science is.

In us humans lives a drive to grasp everything special, isolated in our experience for its own sake, to surrender to the infinite diversity of all being in all its manifestations, to accumulate an inner richness by incessantly absorbing all pure, unprocessed, unbroken "impressions". If this activity wanted to create a language for itself, it would have to coin a special word for each independent peculiarity, each "impression", in order to imitate the infinity of the content lifted out of the experience through the infinity of words. This language would have to be incomparably richer than the Chinese script, which has a special character for each monosyllabic word as a building block of language and therefore has to work with fifty thousand characters. This urge for isolation, for unconnected absorption for oneself, has nothing to do with the desire for knowledge, even though this individuality is everywhere incorporated into science and indeed makes science possible in the first place. For all science seeks to preserve order, to see coherence and connection in the individual, and inquires into the forms of this order. Our language is also a witness to this, expressing not particulars but, to the best of its ability, components of order and thus generalities in its words and sentence structures. The form of our language has its origin in the need for order, in the instinct for knowledge. That is why it always fails when it is given the other task of expressing the manifold particularity of experience. Of course, this order in the given is not created by science, but only pointed out. The fact that there is order in what is

experienced is accepted and seen by us just as much as that this particular peculiar individuality is there. The work of science consists in progressing from the grasping of provisional to the holding of definitive order.

Here it develops a fixed structure of entire individual sciences from the connection of fundamental requirements of order, as is the case for the field of numbers in pure mathematics, for that of spatial formations in geometry; the pure theory of motion and the general theory of change can be classified under these "formal sciences", at the head of which stands the general theory of thought. There it discovers the order in the structure of given peculiarities and their connection based on this as a unified structure: the significance of these "systematic sciences" extends far beyond the circle of crystals, minerals and living beings, many of which still have to develop as independent branches of research. Even in the change of givenness: in becoming - to maintain order, lawfulness, and sequential interconnectedness as in thinking, the "sciences of the laws of becoming" strive both in nature, i.e. in the area of the internally interconnected given, which allows this ordered connection of becoming, and in the psyche, i.e. in the changes of one's own experience. They move towards ever more generalities, ever more comprehensive laws, ever more sequentially connecting, "co-positing" positings. The essence of "causal" natural science and psychology is not based solely on the move towards the general of an ever-higher order, but rather on the "co-setting", "deduction" and "explanation" of the lower-order forms of events from the higher ones. The structure of "laws" is not built upon by empty "abstraction," but rather by a reciprocal relationship between becoming more general and co-constituting ("consequences"). The "historical sciences" are dedicated to the study of ongoing developmental contexts, which have a particularly close relationship to the individual presented and have their associated quality, but how all science proceeds on the perception of certain order, whether these are in the "laws" of the relationship or in the expression of certain peculiar concepts of order, like beauty, goodness, knowledge and other things; But the historical sciences only represent an independent form of knowledge separate from the others if they seek to understand their temporally connected states of development as a unified context, if they pursue a totality of development, a genuine development. We have touched here on the field of other human activities than that of science, which reach into the field of history. Special elements of order are characteristic of those that are viewed in the same way as the ordering of science. The observer sees the beauty in the work of art or in nature as a work of art, just as he sees the good in the moral deed, just as the believer sees the relationship with God in the preached religion; but the artist,

the moral agent, the religious genius does not create the beautiful, the good, the holy, which rather projects into their lives as if from another world, but they allow themselves to be influenced by these "values" they see, while they "create" their work of art, their good deed, their new kind of piety. But while here man surrenders to a perceived order or acts under its guidance, i.e. solves his life's task, in the case of the will to know it is precisely the context of the perceived order itself that becomes the task, from the exploration of which ever new tasks, ever new questions arise. From the results of those non-scientific activities of man, sciences are also possible, which could perhaps be summarized as "sciences of value formations", if they are not also to be integrated into the systematic and law sciences.

Science lies before us as a fragmentary, but as a complete structure of organizational relationships, which here emerge more clearly, there suggest themselves more indeterminately, as a mighty, unfinished building, which in this part shows rooms and corridors, gates and stairs, in that part only the walls of the basement, while in large parts of the buildings plan the guide poles first mark out the ground plan.

But how does science itself come about?

The history of science, like every branch of history, also allows for different approaches. Through its aim of presenting science as a developing whole, it proves its independent justification. The paths to this goal, however, are manifold. Certainly, the history of knowledge will one day be written as a purely factual history of knowledge, as a chronological breakdown of what we previously attempted to survey at a glance. A description of the gradual clarification of the relations of order without any names, without the slightest hint that it was certain individuals who worked on it, who hoped and strove, recognized and erred, a history that gives only dates as clues to the sequence of events. The enrichment of the facts, the acquisition of new methods, the expansion and change of theories are the material of this historiography, the emergence of the order of events, as represented by the exploration of a context of thought, an organised structure, a linkage of development, the result of its work.

Such a story will be written one day, and it is good that it is being done. But this is not the only necessary and correct way of writing history. Equally important is the history of the human mind, which strives to discover that structure of "knowledge". On the pages of this history - as it has probably mostly been intended up to now - one encounters the names of great people on

every page. However much one may emphasize how they, too, depend on their predecessors in their thinking, how general currents, trends of the "spirit of the age", national characteristics influence or support them - at least one of the three deeds that must be done for every new truth is accomplished by one of these great men for the most important insights of every age: their first clear comprehension, the finding of the only appropriate form corresponding to it or the victorious assertion in the general consciousness. This kind of history traces the development of knowledge in the minds of individuals, and it must also follow the errors and failed attempts, the side paths and detours, it must show why this particular question was posed, it must show how a correct result was generalized in the joy of discovery and how what had already been recognized was violated or blocked the way for new research. The ups and downs of theories, their disappearance without refutation, their victory without conclusive proof, their reappearance after a long period of apparent death, all the phenomena that are not rooted in the nature of knowledge but in the nature of the human mind - these are its subject matter. As a result, there will often also be the possibility to successfully support contemporary research by conveying forgotten truths and questions to it, by reconnecting broken threads. In this way, it will itself be directly involved in the construction of knowledge.

But when it describes the contribution made by a Leibniz, a Newton, a Goethe, a Helmholtz to a particular scientific task, it can only lead to a correct understanding if it takes into account not only the one activity of the man Leibniz, Newton, Goethe, Helmholtz, which relates directly to that question, but grasps his whole nature, from which emerges precisely this particular way in which he posed and worked on the task anew. It must therefore depend on the nature of the people through whom knowledge arose. But not only those great men, of whom each century has only a few, have the merit of promoting knowledge. Numerous sharp-witted scholars and thoughtful researchers contribute to the realization of the one context of order and play their part in it. Nor should we forget or despise the many thousands whose names no history will ever be able to mention, who provide a broader basis for the propositions that have been achieved, fill in the gaps that remain and accumulate material for new advances in knowledge.

From this history we will therefore also be able to learn the qualities that make the true researcher, the prerequisites that he must bring with him to flourish in the development of knowledge. It will be possible to show what makes him stand out from the crowd of nameless thousands, and at the same time a yardstick will emerge for the assessment of current conditions.

Although this measure could also be obtained by other considerations, the reference to the teaching of history will nevertheless be conducive to the renewal of the present, strengthen what is healthy and make us aware of its necessity. Of course, we will not be able to take the greats as our model in the effect of their genius. What can only be born with man, we must never hope to attain. That blissful gift of the gods, which confers a deeper and purer experience, a visionary intuition and, above all, an unerring vision of what others blindly pass by every day, that never-unveiled secret of ability, of happy accomplishment: the most sincere will and the most tireless diligence cannot acquire this. But this is also not a prerequisite for fruitful cooperation in the development of science, but only for great, time-transcending achievement.

Rather than a common characteristic of the important men in the history of knowledge, differences between them have attracted attention; particular genres and basic forms of being a researcher have been singled out and various classifications have been made. The successful chemist and historian of chemistry Wilhelm Ostwald, for whom the concept of the "energy of working capacity" became the basis of his natural philosophical and world view, taught us to pay attention to a contrast between researchers based on their working methods and the associated peculiarities of their disposition. The "Romantic" is the lively mind whose thought processes proceed at considerable speed, who therefore also works quickly, disposing of his works in great quantities, which then soon confront him as something foreign and finished, however much they bear the mark of his personality. A person with strong feelings and a lively need to communicate, enthusiastic about his task and inspiring enthusiasm for it. Ostwald has vividly described the chemists Davy, Liebig and Gerhardt as representatives of this basic form of scientist, which moreover often bears the hallmark of precociousness. They are contrasted with the "classicist", who has a slower way of thinking and working, but who also engages with his subject more persistently and intensely. Since he endeavours to leave no possibility out of consideration, only with great difficulty he decides to give up a work as completed, refines and chisels it to completion, which then gives it such an unconditional objectivity that its creator recedes completely behind the work, indeed so that often the path by which he arrived at his results is no longer visible. He is characterized by a calmer and more controlled way of feeling and acting. Robert Mayer, Faraday and Helmholtz are Ostwald's examples of this type of researcher. I don't know whether the term taken from literary history is entirely appropriate for these two forms of mental disposition, because the "speed of reaction" was not the reason for classifying these two art movements; according to Ostwald, our classic writers Schiller and the young

Goethe would obviously be classed as "Romantics", although in Schiller's case this was perhaps later somewhat obscured by his illness. However, the contrast between the two types of character is certainly correct. The fact that the healthy "Romantic" is Sanguineic ¹⁾, the choleric depressed by failure or collapse of his working power, while the "Classicist" tends towards a phlegmatic to melancholic temperament, only shows the inadequacy of this conventional classification of moods. The true sanguine and phlegmatic are characterized by weakness, the true choleric and melancholic by strength of feeling and will. The healthy, still unbroken "romantic" could therefore be better characterized as a "joyful man of action", the "classicist" as a "self-confident thoroughbred".

1) Here the author is referring to the "four temperaments" (or "four humours" in Greco-Roman medicine). Sanguine, choleric, melancholic, and phlegmatic – in the modern day they have been interpreted as joyful, assertive, gentle and curious.

From a different point of view, the historian of biological theories and renowned theorist Em. Rádl ¹⁾ contrasts two groups of researchers: the way in which they approach their problem, their way of thinking, is decisive for him. Contemplation is the guiding star of the "Platonist". He does not want to gain a new treatment of what is already known, but new views; he thinks in images, and even the highest generalizations take on a vivid form in his mind. His contribution to the history of knowledge is not carefully proven chains of thought, pursued in detail, but stimulating ideas. His counterpart is the "Aristotelian", the man of reason, who is characterized not by the freedom of the mind, but by its strict discipline, whose work consists in deduction and reasoning, whose goal is the necessity and consistency of what is known. There Plato, Paracelsus, Buffon, Goethe, here Aristotle, Linné, Kant, Darwin. Here, too, a juxtaposition that cannot be denied its rightful place.

1) Emanuel Rádl (1873 –1942) was an original Czech biologist, historian of science, philosopher and a critical supporter of Masaryk's pre-war democratic Czechoslovakia.

Traditionally, and in the present day with more reason than ever, the "specialist", the man of the narrowest specialist field, has been separated as a distinct phenomenon from those working in the broader field of his science and sometimes the cause of the flattening of our contemporary science has

been seen in this "specialization". But this is not an essential characteristic of the work on knowledge. It is not the narrowness or breadth of the subject area that matters, but the spirit of its penetration. A textbook of general physiology can stick to the individual just as much as the dissection of the life manifestations of the stag beetle can lead to general and valuable insights. One botanist may devote his whole life to the study of a small group of algae and thus make a more important contribution to the growth of knowledge and the elucidation of new classifications than another who deals with the most diverse questions of cell and tissue science, physiology and systematics in the most varied plant species in a surprisingly versatile manner. This is the essential and perhaps also the original meaning of the warning against professionalism, whether one either professionally solves individual questions that have been passed on by one's predecessors according to traditional methods, not looking to the right and not to the left, but only at the random task in its particularity and detachment, or whether one sees each object from the outset as a link in a larger context; whether one brings fundamental questions to one's work. This does not, however, make a distinction between different types of independent researchers, but rather separates the multitude of nameless, albeit not superfluous, practitioners of science from their foremen and builders. Only on this side of this boundary is there any prospect of individual creativity contributing to increasing the content and not just the quantity of the overall achievement of an age. This characteristic of the independent grasp of scientific tasks, of the decisiveness with which the individual is worked on solely for the sake of its context, this characteristic of consciously looking at things in an orderly way is characteristic of all the researchers whose names history mentions to us as promoters of knowledge. Here we have the sought-after characteristic of the true researcher.

Only people who have worked not only on their scientific but also on their human education, for whom looking at the whole and not just the individual has become a characteristic trait, are capable of such a fundamental treatment of scientific questions. Such self-education brings about that unity and cohesion of the psychic overall appearance which makes up the personality. This is what must not be forgotten in the the grand enterprise of contemporary science. That is why it is so pleasant and gratifying when we find among today's researchers, here and there, men whose work, despite all the differences or similarities in the object of research in the course of their investigations, is borne by guiding ideas and therefore shows that unity and consistent development which is the hallmark of personality. It is all the more necessary to speak of this fact, however, because our scientific life does not

nearly sufficiently allow us to recognize enough of this fundamental conception from which a work must grow in order to have the right to the honorary title of "scientific"; because we so often miss that calm certainty of the path taken by the individual researcher; because we see so much unworthy haste to chase after every day's importance, to take a share in every "final success"; because so much unnecessary, i.e. aimless effort is expended that offers no basis for meaningful knowledge or says for the hundredth time what has been said ninety-nine times better. Only those who look at the connections can discover and maintain order. Whatever errors remain in the work of the individual are eliminated by the cooperation of the age and successive generations; but what has once been achieved, the order seen in any part of the given, remains - even if it is temporarily forgotten - and lives on in the work of those to come, creating new questions. And even if the questions never come to an end, more and more large and small features are incorporated into the picture of order: knowledge grows.

In the realization of the moral demand that is addressed to every person whose fateful task it is to pursue science lies the deepest reason and duty for the question we have raised, for the reflection on what science is and how science comes into being. If we, each and every one of us, in the narrowest or the broadest field, want to fulfill our task properly, then we must be aware that science is more than the sum of the opinions of the researchers living today, that it is a structure of relationships of order that becomes clearer in the course of time, and that we are called upon to help clarify this one context, this one, timeless, eternal order.

* * *

Emperor and Chancellor

by Hans Delbrück

Letters from Wilhelm II to the Tsar 1894-1914, edited and introduced by Professor Dr. Walter Goetz. Published by Ullstein & Co; Berlin.

Prince Bismarck's dismissal. Based on the previously unpublished records of the State Secretary of the Interior, Minister of State Dr. Karl Heinrich von Boetticher and the Head of the Imperial Chancellery under Prince Bismarck, Dr. Franz Johannes von Rottenburg. Edited by Professor Dr. Georg Freiherr von Eppstein, Real Privy Councillor. Printed and published by August Scherl G. m. b. H. Berlin.

Memoirs and political memorabilia of former embassy councillor Hermann Freiherr v. Eckardstein, Vol. I, II, published by Paul List, Leipzig.

The letters of Emperor Wilhelm II to Tsar Nicholas, which were handed over to the public by the Russian side, could not be withheld from the German people and have been edited, introduced and provided with continuous commentary by the Leipzig historian Walter Goetz in an exemplary manner. The letters range from the Tsar's accession to the throne in 1894 to the year 1914. As they are written in English, the editor has preceded the English text with a very successful, easy-to-read German translation.

The letters are to be judged according to the same principle as the much-discussed marginal notes. A distinction must be made between the content and the form: the form is often unpleasant and directly embarrassing; diplomatically, there are often some, even many, objections to the content. In the main, however, as far as the intention and aspirations are concerned, it can be seen as favourable to the Emperor. If it has been judged here and there in the German press that the Kaiser carelessly and inadvertently revealed state secrets in these letters, this demonstrates an overly harmless interpretation. I am not revealing any secrets on my part when I assert that these letters, insofar as they are political, were either in the possession of the Foreign Office or were even drafted from models by the Foreign Office. Any diplomatic errors in them are apportioned between the Kaiser and the respective head of foreign policy, just as the responsibility for any other political action is apportioned.

This is precisely the unpleasant, embarrassing aspect of the form: the mixture of friendship and calculation, which, as is typical of diplomacy, borders on deceit and thus covers the whole thing in a fog of untruthfulness in which one cannot feel comfortable. It would be quite unfair, however, to see this course of action as a peculiarity of Kaiser Wilhelm II. Even in the case of diplomats and envoys to foreign courts, personal relationships and the trust or mistrust they inspire play an important role; this is even more so in the case of monarchs, who identify not only their person but also their family with the state to a much greater extent. As long as there have been kings, their marriages and friendships have been politically oriented. However, the fact that family relationships were not seen as a means of politics but, conversely, that politics was to be based on the personal relationships of the rulers, is actually only a product of the 19th century. Gustav Adolf was married to the sister of Elector Georg Wilhelm and once pointed out that he had "a lady from Prussia in his bed", but we do not find that feelings were used to determine policy. The inventor of this way of thinking is Tsar Alexander I. Immediately after his accession to the throne, he had a meeting with Frederick William III and Louise in Memel, and since those days the "friendship" of the two rulers, in which the Queen of Prussia took part, has played a significant role in European politics. Alexander was overflowing with sentiment, especially when he was preparing some plot to harm Prussia. They swore allegiance before the coffin of Frederick the Great. There was certainly no sentimentality in Frederick William III; he was, after all, the most sober of men. But he sought support for his state, of whose weakness he had an all too vivid idea, by cultivating a personal relationship with the powerful tsar. This tradition was reinforced when Alexander's successor, Nicholas I, married the eldest daughter of Frederick William III, and continued with fervour by her brothers, Frederick William IV and William I, who were encouraged in this view by none other and none more than Bismarck. How absurd is the idea that Wilhelm II, by not renewing the Reinsurance Treaty in 1890, severed the link that connected us with Russia! Bismarck himself recognized the unworthiness of this treaty soon enough and, not six months after its conclusion, was still knocking at the opposite door, with England, for admission. (Letter to Salisbury dated November 22, 1887.) If he appeared as if he had succeeded in restoring Alexander III's trust in him, which had been clouded by intrigue, this was hardly self-deception, but a well-calculated tactic to avoid burning all bridges. The Tsar is said to have said to Count Schuwaloff after the famous conversation that supposedly restored peace (November 18, 1887): "I didn't believe a word he said", and four days after the supposedly restored friendship

with the Tsar, Bismarck wrote his letter to Salisbury with the offer of an alliance.*) After a brief deterioration, which of course had the lasting effect of the Russian-French alliance, Germany's rapprochement with Russia was renewed under Caprivi, and the relationship became more intimate than it had ever been. Emperor Wilhelm brokered the marriage between Nicholas II and Princess Alix of Hesse and the exchange of letters began, which testifies to the fact that there was truly no lack of good will on the German side to come to terms with Russia on the basis of mutual recognition and support. One of the means used by Wilhelm II to balance German and Russian interests, in other words, to find areas of work for both states that did not conflict with each other, was to point Russia towards East Asia and the Yellow Sea; if the Russians satisfied their need for expansion here and renounced Constantinople and the Near East, Germany would have been able to pursue its Baghdad Railway policy and the rejuvenation of Turkey undisturbed. To point the tsar in this direction, the emperor painted the "yellow peril" on the wall and appealed to the solidarity of Christendom against paganism, Buddhism and barbarism. He supported the power of the word with a picture of Buddha he had designed himself with the caption: "Peoples of Europe, protect your most sacred treasures!" To what extent was this conviction, to what extent tactics? Professor Goetz, the editor of the letters, now asks the same question. Presumably, the high author himself was not aware of this enough to give a definite answer.

*) The nature of the reinsurance contract is first fully clarified in an article in the "Deutsche Allgemeine Zeitung" of September 14, 1919 by Dr. P. Rassow and Dr. Daniels in the October issue of the Prussian Yearbook 1919. The Tsar's statement on Schuwaloff is reported in Eckardstein, Lebenserinnerungen, Vol. I, p. 136.

As a source, this collection of letters is of course very one-sided. The Tsar's replies are still missing. The dispatches between the letters are also missing and, above all, the intermittent and simultaneous statements addressed to the opposite side, to England. In these letters to the Tsar, the Emperor repeatedly appears as the sworn enemy and hater of England and the English. We remember, however, that when he came to power he was suspected of being filled with a maternally inherited affection for England and of being determined by this affection in his policy, and in the Boer War he gave the English strategic advice. When the Kaiser was in England in 1901, he was cheered and praised for his tact, and in the eyes of almost every Englishman he was the most popular figure in the country.*) This alternation between pro-

Russian and pro-English politics is nothing new. We find exactly the same with Bismarck, who repeatedly asserted that the only people with whom he had an inner sympathy were the English, and always alternately appealed to them and the Russians for alliance. In his farewell petition he referred to the necessity of maintaining our good relations with Russia not long before, but in one of his last major Reichstag speeches (January 26, 1889) he praised England as our traditional ally and explained to King Albert of Saxony that he regarded the accession of England as a necessary supplement to the German-Austrian alliance.

*) Eckardstein II, 255, 259, 270

**) Eckardstein I, 323.

There is nothing more wrong than to censure Wilhelm II because he continued Bismarck's policy with such manoeuvring. What bothers us is the sentimentality in which the political calculation is disguised and the lack of tact and delicacy in the way in which the influence on the imperial friend is exerted or should be exerted - assuming that the intrusive advice was not provoked by the Tsar, about which we can say nothing for the time being for lack of his letters. The factual error does not lie in the fact that no definite and irrevocable choice was made between England and Russia - for that was impossible - but in the so often faulty calculation of the individual moves. If you want to follow this, I recommend that you read the imperial letters and compare them with Professor Fr. Luckwaldt's little book: "Politische Geschichte des Weltkrieges", first volume "Von Bismarck bis Eduard VII. (1890 bis 1906)". Götschen Collection. In masterly brevity, the inner context of world politics from Bismarck's last years onwards is presented both objectively and critically. Luckwaldt even has the courage to raise the question in the introduction whether Bismarck was right to take back Alsace-Lorraine in 1871 and whether it would not have been better to grant peace to republican France without ceding it, in order to make Germany immediately aware of its maritime interests. He does not claim that one should or even could have acted in this way, but merely raises the question. I might add that Prince Henckel-Donnersmark, on whose judgment Bismarck placed a great deal of trust, did indeed suggest to him very seriously at the time that he should renounce the annexation, as it would create an eternally irreconcilable enmity between us and France. But would German public opinion have tolerated this?

Even the mistakes in Wilhelm II's policy were not in the least forced by the unruliness of public opinion. The Kaiser was generally the moderating force in our policy, except in the area of naval reinforcement. Above all, it is wrong, fundamentally wrong, to claim that he took a fundamentally different course than Bismarck. Everything that he strove for and undertook was already germinating under Bismarck. Luckwaldt wittily characterizes the change that began in 1890 and the error that can be observed from then on in the dispatch that the Emperor sent to his great-uncle in Weimar after Bismarck's dismissal: "The course remains the same. Full steam ahead." "This program," writes Luckwaldt, "was an internal impossibility. The course that Bismarck had steered, between cliffs and shoals, had been calculated at half speed; if you gave full steam ahead, you had to change course: more out into the open sea, or you ran aground.

The error of German policy therefore lay not in the direction taken in 1890, but in its temperament, and the imperial letters only confirm this long-recognized truth anew. They confirm that the high author, far from striving for any kind of world hegemony, had nothing in mind but to secure the German people its share in world politics, its place in the sun, alongside the other great civilized nations, through an active policy without war. The editor Goetz therefore justifiably states in his introduction that "these letters need not shy away from the light of publicity." Whatever one may criticize about them, it is balanced and outweighed by the underlying good will.

Every consideration of the policy that ultimately led to the world war, or rather, failed to avoid it, always leads back to the great crisis of the dismissal of the first Reich Chancellor. Great men not only shape their time, but also determine to a large extent public opinion's view of their time through the authority of their judgment and their statements. Of no one is this more true than of Bismarck; no matter how much one may point out that his representations necessarily bear the character of one-sidedness and partisanship, it is always difficult to come to terms with what he once said. Given the immense bitterness with which his dismissal filled him, it is precisely about this act that one can least expect an accurate account from him. We will have to come back to this when the third volume of his memoirs is published. ¹⁾ The above-mentioned publication by Baron von Eppstein does not correspond to its title; it provides neither a narrative nor an investigation of the dismissal, but only, without touching on the actual problem, some documentary, albeit quite valuable, contributions. In a kind of persecution mania, the Prince is known to have accused his closest colleagues, the other

ministers and in particular the State Secretary of the Interior, von Boetticher, until then his best colleague and closest confidant, of plotting against him. Boetticher's notes, which Eppstein has now published together with a transcript by the head of the Reich Chancellery in Rottenburg, leave no doubt that there is no shadow of truth in this accusation. Anyone who knew Mr. von Boetticher and looked at things with some degree of impartiality could never have believed anything else, and Eppstein's publication therefore brings nothing new in this respect. As certainly as there was intrigue, especially on the part of Privy Councillor von Holstein, this intrigue certainly had no real influence on the fact of the dismissal, and Boetticher can least of all be accused of it. However, Eppstein's publication is extremely interesting in a negative respect. It shows that Bismarck was far from letting two men as close to him as Boetticher and Rottenburg in on the last secrets of his politics. These world-historical personalities are the least likely to let themselves be seen through by those closest to them. "If I could believe that my shirt, even my skin, knew anything about what I want to do, I would tear it," Frederick the Great once wrote. One could also apply this saying to Bismarck. Afterwards, of course, he was often quite open-hearted, and so it was possible for me to reveal the true connection as early as 1906, based on Prince Hohenlohe's memoirs. My statement aroused immense indignation at the time, but has now been fully confirmed by the Kaiser's letter to Emperor Franz Joseph about the events surrounding the dismissal, which was published in the Austrian Rundschau (February 1, 1919) (Austrian Review). For all the details, I can refer you to the account in my book "Bismarck's Legacy" (Verlag Ullstein, 1915). The reason for the separation of the Kaiser from the Chancellor, the monarch from the patriarch of Germany, was not, as Bismarck repeatedly tried to insinuate, foreign policy. The Kaiser explicitly states this in his letter to Franz Joseph. The differences that existed here were so insignificant that an agreement could very easily have been reached if there had been goodwill on both sides. Bismarck had had to fight through quite different disagreements with William the Elder. The difference did not lie in social policy, in the legislation for the protection of workers, as stated in Rottenburg's letter, since Bismarck, even though he opposed the Kaiser on this point, showed a willingness to give in. The real, irreconcilable difference lay in the different positions towards the Reichstag. After his attempt to reach an agreement with Windthorst ²⁾ had been unsuccessful, Bismarck wanted to "blow up" the Reichstag, with which he was no longer able to govern; he now wanted the coup d'état he had been contemplating for a long time. He wanted to deprive all notorious Social Democrats of the right to vote and stand for election and

had already effectively initiated the action by bringing down the Socialist Law through an extremely skilful intrigue. He wanted to let the Social Democrats out of this cage once, so that the citizens would realize how necessary it was to keep them locked up. Then he wanted to strike with maximum force. The Kaiser did not want this fight and this policy. There was no compromise and there could be none. In this conflict, the dispute over labour protection legislation was secondary. Both the Kaiser and Bismarck saw it from the point of view of tactics: whether or not Social Democracy should be put down by force. The fact that the Prince's official resignation did not mention the final and decisive reason for the separation did not, of course, eliminate it. Bismarck would not have had to be the superior diplomatic tactician that he was if he had not done everything in his power to conceal this motive, which revealed his weakness, as far as possible. He did not even reveal it to Bötticher and Rottenburg. Only the emperor knew it and some conservatives saw through it.

1) "Bismarck The Man And The Statesman Vol III" by Otto Von Bismarck, A. J. Butler

<https://archive.org/details/bismarck-the-man-and-the-statesman-vol-3>

2) Baron Ludwig von Windthorst (1812 –1891)

The German people today resent Wilhelm II, who led us into misfortune; they revere the memory of Bismarck, who made us great. The historian sees that it was not this or that individual mistake that plunged us into misfortune, but that we perished precisely because of our own greatness, the greatness created by Bismarck, which was our pride, inspired our striving and thereby provoked the jealousy, fear and envy of the other nations against us, until they all united against us to crush us.

Only after we have gained the correct background by referring back to the crisis of 1890 and Bismarck's policy do we want to enter into a discussion of whether Germany could have been saved by an alliance with England and why this path was not taken. The already quoted work by the embassy counsellor Baron von Eckardstein is a single, thundering indictment of German policy, of the Kaiser, of Herr von Holstein, of Prince Bülow, of Herr von Bethmann and, above all, of course, of Herr von Tirpitz, for having, in unfortunate blindness, rejected the friendship offered to them by England, the English ministers and King Edward, and for having forced England itself into the Russian-French

alliance.*) The revelations that Eckardstein presents about German-English negotiations, the documents that he prints, are of the highest importance; one also reads with interest the chatty memoir-like details that he relates (even if I have repeatedly come across incorrect information). But is his judgment that it was nothing but short-sightedness, fickleness, caprice, weakness in the face of public opinion, which had been stirred up by England, that repeatedly prevented the conclusion of a German-English alliance, really tenable? Tirpitz, Reventlow, Hoetzsch and Bernhard defended the Russian orientation with exactly the same passion with which Eckardstein championed the English orientation. The tragedy of Germany's fate is that they are both in the right, namely in the negative; that they refute each other; that both alliances were impossible; that it was not suspicion, negligence and fickleness, but good, objective reasons that stood in the way of the implementation of both policies. The fact that we could not come together with England is, of course, all the more remarkable as first Germany sought the English alliance and then England again sought the German alliance. The first attempt at rapprochement, as we now learn from Eckardstein, was made by Bismarck as early as 1875, when he sent Lothar Bucher to London, and from then on, repeatedly. According to Prince Münster, however, England was not yet "ready for an alliance". The attempts made by England in 1895, 1898, 1899 and 1901 all failed due to the idea that Germany would thereby make itself a "Landsknecht" ¹⁾ of England against Russia; that the alliance with England, however it was formulated, would involve us in a war with Russia. The Kaiser and the German people, however, did not want war, but peace. Eckardstein asked whether, by rejecting the English alliance, we had escaped war with Russia? Quite right. Any war in alliance with England would always have ended better for us than this war against England. But we did not want a war at all, and moreover there were two obstacles which, as far as I can see, could not be overcome. Firstly, the resistance of public opinion, which would never have agreed to a war against Russia that resulted from an alliance with England. Secondly, the fact that the fruit of such a war would have been of highly doubtful value to Germany. Lord Salisbury offered us the partition of Turkey in 1895. But what use would Little Asia have been to us without a fleet? Germany would have had to be content with a position as a minor power forever. But if we built the fleet, war with England would have immediately loomed. The English would certainly not have waged the war against Russia to its complete destruction, but only to the point where a rump state remained that was no longer a threat to themselves, and would then have immediately joined forces with this rump state against us so as not to allow us to become

too large. This is how England and France joined forces against Russia in the Crimean War, only to let Russia go in a very mild peace after it had been defeated and then immediately become so aggressive against each other that war was just around the corner. A German-English coalition war against Russia twenty or ten years ago would have ended no differently. Then the criticism would have been: how could Germany have been so foolish as to become deadly enemies with Russia for the love of England? But freed from the fear of Russia, Austria-Hungary would have turned away from the German alliance, and we would ultimately have been not in a better, but in an even worse position than the one we found ourselves in in 1914.

*) The author has prefaced his detailed memoirs with a short excerpt, a 32-page brochure entitled "Diplomatische Enthüllungen zum Ursprung des Weltkrieges" (Diplomatic Revelations on the Origins of the World War), which was published by Carl Curtius and reviewed by Gustav Roloff in the September 1919 issue together with Hammann's work.

1) Landsknecht: a member of a class of mercenary soldiers in the German and other continental armies in the 16th and 17th centuries.

It is certainly worth the effort to read Eckardstein and to immerse oneself completely in this world of thought of a German-English alliance; if only to counterbalance the now so widespread opposite idea of the Russian alliance, which we would have neglected. But this idea, with all the bitter criticism that the author attaches to it, should not be accepted any more than the Russian enthusiasm in the other camp. Certainly, German policy was only a zigzag policy, made even more tremulous by imperial rodomontades ¹⁾ and parade successes, but the Russian or British policy that is recommended to us instead is always only the policy seen from one angle, not from central point of view.

1) Rodomontade, "vainglorious boasting, bragging," early 17th century: a reference to Rodomonte, a character in the Italian Renaissance epic poems Orlando Innamorato and Furiosa (Orlando in Love and the Frenzy).

It is true that the policy of shuttling back and forth between the two world powers, so as not to join either of them, ultimately turned us both into enemies. But it was too quickly concluded that our fate was already sealed. The four years have shown that we were capable of weathering the storm, and it is fair to say that we could even have emerged from it quite well if General

Ludendorff had realized the insight that dawned on him at the end of September 1918—the insight which, according to his own memoirs (p. 581) ¹⁾, was that America had offered us acceptable conditions and could enforce them—six months or even five-quarters of a year earlier.

1) General Erich Ludendorff's memoirs, titled "My War Memories, 1914-1918".

* * *

On the preliminary draft of the Judicial Constitution Act

by Chamber Court Judge Dr. Sontag, Berlin

The Reich Minister of Justice has presented and announced in the press a draft reforming the part of the Judicial Constitution Act that deals with the reorganization of criminal courts and criminal proceedings. The draft follows the old text of the law in that it adapts a number of points of the Courts Constitution Act to the requirements of the Reich constitution and the new era. However, in some respects it overlooks aspects that require improvement and some that could easily be improved. On the other hand, it offers several other changes that are both questionable and far-reaching. Therefore, this draft cannot be passed by without criticism, given its great importance for the entire German people.

1. The most important and at the same time most alarming innovation is the complete elimination of the criminal chamber as the court of first instance. This means that the previous three-tiered division of our criminal courts will be abolished, leaving only lay assessor's courts and jury courts, and the consequence of this is that the large area of offenses for which the criminal division was previously responsible will be assigned to the lay assessor's courts. These offenses include, among others, hostile acts against friendly states, offenses relating to the exercise of civil rights, sedition, false accusations, religious offenses, offenses relating to personal status, immorality offenses, embezzlement, usury, etc., in which the individual cases are often so difficult in factual and legal terms that not every lay judge can be entrusted with the conduct of such a trial - and alone at that. As a court of the lowest order, the lay judges' court is completely unsuitable for sentencing crimes. Today, the hearing in all the cases mentioned is presided over by a district court director, i.e. a person selected from the number of judges on the basis of their abilities, and he is assisted by four assessors, one of whom, the rapporteur, knows the files just as well as the presiding judge and is just as prepared as the latter for the legal questions likely to arise. In the event of any difficulty, however, the five jurists can withdraw for consultation. In future, the lay judge will have to deal with all of this alone, because the two lay judges sitting at his side are no help in solving legal issues that arise or in conducting the trial. When will the single lay judge finally be able to make all

the - sometimes quite extensive - judgments that were previously divided between the four assessors?

A court made up of two or three jurists and inserted between the court of lay assessors and the jury court will therefore, in my opinion, continue to be indispensable in the future. The "grand jury court" often called for in the literature could be considered as such. On the question of whether this should be made up of two or three lawyers, I would give preference to the latter *), so that a majority of experts can be formed for legal questions, which the laypersons can then join. If there are only two lawyers on the panel and they are - as is often to be expected - of different opinions, the laypersons will be at a loss in the face of the dispute between the two lawyers, and they will ultimately have to decide the disputed legal issues, which they will often not be able to follow. Furthermore, if there are two lawyers, one of whom presides over and prepares the case, there is a lack of sufficient manpower to draft the judgments.

*) The newly established usury chambers are also composed of 3 judges and 2 lay assessors. § 4 of the ordinance of 27. 11. 19. RSBl. p. 1909.

If the draft did not include the grand lay judges' court, the fact that appeals against mixed courts are an unavoidable requirement of our time will probably have been a determining factor. However, appeals from the large lay judges' courts convening at the Regional Court would go to the Higher Regional Court. The higher regional courts, however, cannot possibly be burdened with criminal appeal cases. Firstly, this is incompatible with their position, which serves more to investigate the law than the facts, and secondly, given the size of our provinces, it is not possible to summon the number of people who are called upon to hear appeals in major cases for days and weeks to the seat of the Higher Regional Court, which is geographically distant from most places in the province.

These difficulties could easily be avoided if the large lay judges' courts were also convened at the local court. Appeals from them would then go to the criminal chambers in the same way as those from the small lay judges' courts. In my opinion, the fact that the Court of Appeal is not more heavily staffed than the Court of First Instance does not give rise to any reservations. With the austerity required in Germany in the future, we will have to get used to seeing the superiority of the higher court not in the appointment of more judges, but in the appointment of more intellectually significant judges.

Of the crimes for which, according to the draft, the jury court should retain jurisdiction, I would like to assign perjury and bank fraud to the grand juries. Experience has shown that the reopening of the old trial, in which the perjury is said to have been committed, in the context of the new criminal proceedings has often confused the jurors. Likewise, it has proved to be an unreasonable demand to require jurors to follow the explanations of a banker's management, the evidence from the books of account and all the economic and accounting transactions discussed without knowledge of the files and without having studied the commercial correspondence, expert opinions, books of account and the like, in such a way that they can reach a correct verdict.

2. According to § 40 G.V.G., the selection of judges is carried out by a committee whose chairman is the district magistrate and whose assessors are, apart from a state administrative officer, seven elected representatives of the district court. In future, these elections are to be carried out according to the proportional representation system, in line with all other elections to be held in Germany. If the districts are too small for proportional representation to be introduced in a viable manner, a different mode of election shall be provided for.

This raises the question as to why the draft, which is too attached to the old system, has missed the opportunity to abolish a slow and, in my opinion, completely unnecessary election procedure. The commissioners for the selection of lay judges are representatives of the municipalities from which the lay judges are elected. Their task is a supervisory one. Why should we not entrust this task to the personalities who are also the elected representatives of the communities, namely the leaders of the communities in question; however, so that they should not be unnecessarily burdened with this subordinate work, they could still be granted the power of delegation.

According to § 41 G.V.G., there is no right of appeal against the committee's decisions. However, this has proved necessary in practice, particularly in the case of denominational deferrals. Nevertheless, the draft leaves it as it is. Here, too, it should have been a little more *novarum rerum cupidus* (i.e. innovative).

3. The circle of the people's judges is extended to include women, domestic servants, elementary school teachers, etc., in line with the trend of our time. There is nothing to be said against this; but the more lay judges with a lower level of education are called upon, the more the draft would have had the duty to take care to train the lay judges for their office. However, this is not

satisfied by the fact that the individual lay judge may in future be called seven times a year instead of five. There is still such a long time between the individual sessions that he will have forgotten the little experience he has gained in one session by the next. In view of the increased importance of the lay judges' courts in the future, it must be demanded that the lay judges become familiar with the administration of justice in a completely different way than before. It therefore seems necessary for them to sit at least once a month. The concern that such a requirement will be too time-consuming for the lay judges seems all the less significant the more so that manual labourers are called upon to serve as lay judges. They will be happy to perform their jury duty every month if their daily wages are replaced. The lay judges should also be elected for five years rather than one year. Only lay judges who are called upon for at least this length of time can provide the presiding judge with services similar to those provided by commercial judges to the presiding judge of the Chamber for Commercial Matters. The lay judges will learn to distinguish between the basic concepts of criminal law, they will gain knowledge of the law and of human nature, and their greater experience will go hand in hand with a stronger sense of duty. The hearings and deliberations would be faster and safer.

However, not everyone whose intellect is sufficient to serve as a lay judge in the small lay judges' courts will be qualified to serve in the higher courts dealing with larger and more serious criminal cases. It would therefore be advisable to include a provision to the effect that only those who have served as lay judges in the small lay judges' courts for at least five years and have proven themselves in this capacity may become lay judges in the large lay judges' courts and the criminal chambers, as well as jurors. Transitional provisions will of course have to be enacted for the first few years.

4. In future, the criminal division is only to be a court of appeal against the judgments of the small lay judges' courts. According to the draft, it is to be composed of two professional judges and three lay assessors. I would propose a composition of three professional judges and two lay judges for the same reasons that I have given above for the composition of the large lay judges' courts. Forgotten in the draft is the indispensable provision as to who determines the number of lay judges required for each criminal division and their distribution among the court districts. The President of the Higher Regional Court would probably be the best person to do this.

5. The draft has left the number of jurors unchanged - at twelve. There do not seem to me to be any compelling reasons for this. Seven jurors should be entirely sufficient. Given the great need for lay assessor material, a reduction in the number of jurors should be desirable in itself. However, seven jurors offer just as much guarantee for the correctness of a verdict as twelve. Also, the smaller the number of jurors required, the fewer difficulties there will be in filling the jury box fully and punctually.

6. The bill has abolished the examining magistrate. But in my opinion, it can only abolish the title and the assignment of this work to a judge. The conduct of a preliminary investigation will remain indispensable for major crimes and offenses. Since the draft does not say who should be responsible for this work in future, it must be assumed that it has assigned it to the public prosecutor's office. *) This resolves an old dispute in favour of the St. A.¹⁾. One could have been all the more satisfied with this if the entire activity had been transferred undividedly to the St. A. **), since one of the best innovations of the draft is the provision that some of the police officers are to be attached to the public prosecutor's office in such a way that they work directly under the public prosecutor and in his offices. Here the St. A. has a rewarding task ahead of it in the training of these criminal investigators and in their skillful deployment. ***)

*) This is confirmed by the draft of the St. P. O.²⁾

1) St. A – abbreviation for „Staats anwaltschaft“ / „Staatsanwaltschaft“ (Public Prosecutor)??

2) St. P. O. – one could guess this is an abbreviation of “State Prosecutors Office” although the letters do not match Staatsanwaltschaft.

**) However, as we learn from the draft of a new code of criminal procedure, a not unobjectionable division of the preliminary proceedings between St A. and the district judge is envisaged.

***) Justice Councillor Hugo Sonnenfeld, Berlin, has made the interesting suggestion that, if the provisions of the draft were to become law, a further provision would be created to the effect that the Bar Association should appoint individual lawyers for a period of about one year who would carry out investigations and interrogations with police support in the same way as the public prosecutor's office. Of course, these lawyers should not be involved in defence cases.

However, if the preliminary investigation is the responsibility of the public prosecutor, then it is probably advisable to adopt a provision from military criminal law which has proved to be very successful there, namely that the public prosecutor who conducted the preliminary investigation also represents the prosecution in the main hearing.

(7) If an O.L.G.¹⁾ wishes to deviate from the decision of another Higher Regional Court or the Imperial Court of Justice on a legal issue in the future (†), it is obliged under the draft to submit the dissenting opinion in a report to the Imperial Court of Justice; the O.L.G. must inevitably follow the Imperial Court of Justice's subsequent decision.

1) The abbreviation "O.L.G." stands for Oberlandesgericht, or "Higher Regional Court".

†) Who, *nota bene* (i.e. "take note"), wants to collect all the judgments of all the higher regional courts?

This provision amounts to a serious restriction of the freedom of jurisdiction; for many a higher regional court will be far more likely to decide to issue a judgment that deviates from a decision of the Imperial Court than to merely submit its dissenting opinion to the Imperial Court in the form of a report. Furthermore, if this decision becomes law, in future only decisions of the Imperial Court of Justice will be published in the most important disputes, but no longer decisions of the Higher Regional Court. Furthermore, if this decision becomes law, in the future, only decisions of the Imperial Court will be published on the most important disputed issues, and no longer decisions of the Higher Regional Court. These courts would no longer reach a judgment at all, but would likely be instructed by the Imperial Court in most cases to adhere to its old practice. This would deprive scholars of the opportunity to critically challenge the practice of the Imperial Court based on dissenting decisions of the Higher Regional Court. An important path to converting the Imperial Court would thus be forever cut off; the danger of stagnation in jurisprudence would be unmistakable.

Section 123b of the draft is modelled on Section 28 of the Act on Voluntary Jurisdiction. In the F.G.G., however, the need to preserve legal unity through such a provision is incomparably greater than in criminal law, since in the latter the disputes cannot otherwise reach the Imperial Court to the same extent as in criminal law.

8) The Presidium of the Regional Court has not been expanded in the draft, as would be appropriate today. In my opinion, the Presidium should consist, in addition to its President and the Directors, of the Chief Public Prosecutor, a Public Prosecutor, and two attorneys-at-law appointed by the Board of the Bar Association. In courts with more than twelve directors, perhaps a Public Prosecutor and an attorney-at-law would be necessary for every six directors.

9. An appeal on points of law, or as it should be called in the future, an appeal on points of law, against judgments of the Criminal Chamber should only be possible if the decision of the Imperial Court is requested by the public prosecutor's office in agreement with the Chief Public Prosecutor. Here, equality between the defense and the prosecution must be demanded for reasons of fairness, i.e., the defense attorney must also be allowed to request that the Imperial Court of Justice review the case, and the consent of the Chief Public Prosecutor must be equated with the request of a defense attorney admitted to the Imperial Court of Justice, but only of such an attorney.

* * *

The German Reich

by Dr. Friedrich Lohmann

The motion by the majority factions of the Prussian State Assembly to establish a unified German state has sparked strong expressions of feeling and opinion everywhere and brought a veritable flood of paper upon us. The watchdogs of all parties and states have dutifully barked as a sign of their vigilance. We ask ourselves: was the noise necessary? Or do the power of the facts and the logic of the constitution not speak their quiet language?

A dispassionate, enlightening examination of the question seems to us to be an urgent need. Let us first consider the legal situation created by the new Reich Constitution. Although the constitution technically retains the construction that the states retain all rights that are not expressly transferred to the Reich, a number of important powers have now been transferred to the Reich. In the legislative field, the Reich has both exclusive and concurrent competence (Articles 6, 7, 8), legislative intervention is subject to the condition that there is a need for the enactment of uniform regulations (Article 9), and the Reich can finally establish principles by way of legislation (Articles 10, 11). If one goes through the catalogue of competences, one recognizes the extraordinary shift in favour of the Reich. It is difficult to find a subject that is not a matter for the realm. Thus, areas that had previously been strongholds of state sovereignty, such as the police, the school system, the relations of religious societies and the right of expropriation, became matters of imperial legislation. Furthermore, the unconditional competence of the Reich is established. Whereas previously the Federal Council could veto constitutional amendments with 14 votes or, in the case of so-called reserve rights, with the votes of those with special powers (Article 78), now a two-thirds majority of parliament or an approving referendum overrides the opposition of the Imperial Council (Article 76). Administrative sovereignty henceforth lies with the states only insofar as the Reich itself does not make use of it (Article 14), and Reich supervision is tightened (Article 15). Article 17 allows the Reich to intervene in the constitution and the organization of the states.

In detail, we highlight the following points of the expansion program of the Reich - the so-called judicialization, as the ugly slogan goes:

The military constitution has already become fully a matter for the Reich, taxation is standardized to the limits of what is possible. The responsibility of the state in the field of transportation is to be abolished by April 1920. The competence of the Reich in economic and social matters is emphasized. The Reich is an economic area. The individual states do not have a self-contained economic life. As far as uniformity is required, the issues of school legislation and welfare are in the hands of the Reich; the legislative preparatory work in this regard has already been underway for some time. In the field of agriculture, the Reich is responsible for the agricultural settlement system, the binding of land ownership and the distribution of land. In the police sector, there is a need to standardize the security police, the expansion of which has proved necessary due to the internal political situation. The very fact that the measures to impose a state of emergency are ordered by the President of the Reich in accordance with Article 48, Paragraph 2 of the Reich Constitution indicates the need for a Reich-wide organization of the security police. It has also become apparent in practice that a superstructure of the political and criminal police is highly desirable. The other functions of the administrative police (trade police, building police, forestry police, sanitary police, etc.) can remain with or be attached to those branches of the administration whose resources they are. In our opinion, there is no immediate need to make the administration of justice a matter for the Reich. The administration of justice is independent, and its administrative affairs can continue to be administered by the states for some time without inconvenience. The necessary legal unity is guaranteed by the Imperial Court of Justice.

It is obvious that most of the tasks of the empire, apart from the first three areas of defence, taxation and transport, where strict centralization is appropriate, can only be solved by means of decentralization and further self-administration. Even within the Prussian state, the bureaucratic system has practically resorted to decentralization in many areas. The provincial central authorities, often on the basis of legal suggestions, recognizing that they were not in a position to grasp local needs in time and to keep in touch with the circumstances, transferred individual powers to the subordinate provincial authorities. The force of the facts shows the path that politicians and experts in constitutional law have to take.

In place of the vertical division of powers under the old Reich constitution, according to which the Reich legislature was responsible for some matters "from top to bottom", while other areas were left entirely to the individual states, a horizontal division must be introduced, as already

developed by Mr. Koch, the present Reich Minister of the Interior, during the first reading of the constitution and the committee deliberations. In future, the Reich must generally reserve for itself only the top layer of legislative and administrative orders and must leave the lower layers to the states in the interests of healthy decentralization. This again necessarily leads to self-government. The assumption of the entire responsibility by the competent head of the Reich administration is impracticable: attempts in this direction would be a comedy or a failure. There are also financial advantages in having matters dealt with by self-governing bodies, since the economical and appropriate use of funds is in the self-governing authorities' own interest.

The gradual implementation of the constitutional program over the coming years and decades will result in a natural erosion of the competence of the states and their inevitable establishment as administrative entities. Artificial measures to accelerate or prevent this process would violate elementary laws of state and constitutional law. This is by no means an obstacle to the fact that forward-looking politicians in the states are already taking this development into account in their laws and plans and avoiding any disruptive measures. Externally, the peculiar picture that will emerge in the near future is that the states will partly operate as decentralization and self-governing bodies, but partly still as national governments with the remnants of statehood.

It is desirable to depoliticize the government bodies of the states as far as possible in the interest of the proper implementation of the imperial decrees. The political orientation is appropriately summarized in the supreme authority; in the implementation provisions, which are left to the individual states, political aspects can often be left out of the equation entirely. Even if politics can never be completely banished from the self-governing bodies, as we see with the municipal assemblies, it will gradually recede more and more for lack of suitable tasks; this would then be associated with a significant simplification of political life.

The barren coexistence and opposition of the states and the reich, which every practitioner and insightful theorist already feels to the fullest extent, will gradually be recognized more and more clearly by the majority of politicians and the great mass of the people as a factual and financial impossibility. Outdated forms will no longer be able to adapt to reality and will be blown away by the winds of progress. We must understand the psyche of the people and gently and gradually make clear to them what they have long felt below

the threshold of consciousness. The less noise is made, the better. We must avoid provoking popular resistance artificially staged by leaders and lobbyists through clumsy interventions. In practice, the public is already becoming accustomed to attacking the Reich authorities and blaming them for everything, sometimes without even knowing the state authorities. Tribal differences and psychological antagonisms are present in every nationally united large state, without this standing in the way of the idea of unity and cohesion. Instinctive feelings of fellow nationals must be appreciated but need not be sanctified. Contrasts also exist within the individual states, indeed between the inhabitants of the individual districts. The Upper Bavarian differs from the Swabian, and the latter from the Franconian tribe, the Brandenburger from the Pomeranian and Silesian, and yet they belong together in their individual regional associations. The feeling of belonging that has developed in the dynastically united countries must be respected by preserving certain forms, without allowing self-serving aspirations of interest groups to take hold.

The development will take place calmly, without the mentality of any community needing to be violated, although any bureaucratic intrigues must be resolutely countered. Dynastic interests, the wishes of court purveyors and similar considerations are ruled out; the selfish thoughts of individual state officials would not stand up to public criticism; the soul of the people must not be offended by foreign officials. (Article 16 of the Reich Constitution.) The organs of the state central governments will inevitably adapt to the new tasks through reorganization.

Prussia's position in the new empire poses difficulties. Prussia is inconceivable as a self-governing body; it would always remain a state within a state. If the Reich were to hand over tasks to Prussia, this would not mean decentralization, but a transfer from one large state to another. The fact that two governments, the imperial government and the Prussian state government, are responsible for two-thirds of the territory of the empire has an inhibiting and confusing effect on the governments and outsiders. In fact, there is often a lack of clarity about who is responsible. Should the Reich government or the Prussian state government be held responsible for measures to increase coal production in the Ruhr area or in Upper Silesia? Not even the politicians and civil servants working in the field are familiar with the distinction; for them in particular, working side by side and against each other becomes unbearable in the long run. We must say it clearly for once: In the old empire, Germany was ruled by Prussia – hence the justified mistrust of the non-Prussian federal

states towards “Berlin”, which even insightful Prussians could not escape. But now that almost all state functions have been transferred to the Reich and Prussia has lost its hegemony – which is only welcomed by non-Prussians and German-minded Prussians – the preservation of a Prussian central government would be an outright error in thinking and organization. Every practitioner is well aware of this fact, and yet only a few recognize its full implications, let alone express them.

For the Prussian territory, the Reich can only assign the powers and tasks to be decentralized to the provinces in consultation with the state government; the latter, for its part, gives the provinces increased independence. In this way, the position of the Prussian central government, which is contrary to organization, will not only be undermined from above, as in the other states, but also from below: Prussia will be absorbed into Germany, as Brandenburg was once absorbed into Prussia, whereby a Prussian state association could be retained for certain functions out of piety. This process, which is a simple consequence of the new imperial idea, will have to take place slowly and organically at the same time as the implementation of the constitutional program. Efforts to break away from Prussian regions must be carefully observed and managed so that efficient and loyal self-governing bodies of the German Reich can be created. First of all, it will have to be the practical task of the Reich to exert influence on the Prussian government – by no means the other way round – so that friction is avoided and an organic transition is prepared through joint work.

If Prussia is too large to fit into the framework of the Reich as a homogeneous body, there are, on the other hand, a number of tiny and fragmented state entities in our fatherland. These states have long been unable to fulfill their administrative and cultural tasks; this will be all the less possible if the circle of public tasks is expanded even further. It is not at all necessary for the self-governing bodies to be of equal size – there are also small and large urban districts and rural districts – but a certain minimum size is certainly necessary to fulfill their tasks. Thuringia is in the process of merging: The logic of necessity will bring about further changes to the inner-German map over the next few years.

* * *

Translator's notes regarding Czech history ahead of the following article by Emil Daniels.

Jan Hus (or Johannes Huss) (1369 – 1415) was a Czech theologian and philosopher who became a Church reformer and the inspiration of Hussitism.

Hus was burned at the stake by The Catholic Church for heresy in 1415. This led to the Hussite Wars (1419-1434) which were fought between the Hussites and the combined Catholic forces of Holy Roman Emperor Sigismund, the Papacy, and European monarchs loyal to the Catholic Church, as well as various Hussite factions.

In Prague and various other parts of Bohemia, the Catholic Germans living there were forced out.

At a late stage of the conflict, in 1432 the Utraquists changed sides to fight alongside Roman Catholics and opposed the Taborites and other Hussite factions.

As the conflicts went on, the Hussites also made raids into German territory.

The wars ended in 1434 when the moderate Utraquist faction of the Hussites defeated the radical Taborite faction.

The Hussites agreed to submit to the authority of the king of Bohemia and the Roman Catholic Church.

The Battle of White Mountain (8 November 1620) was an important battle in the early stages of the Thirty Years' War.

An army of 21,000 Bohemians and mercenaries was defeated by 23,000 men of the combined armies of Holy Roman Emperor Ferdinand II.

In 1622 Ferdinand II made Karl Lichtenstein governor and viceroy of Bohemia.

It led to the defeat of the Bohemian Revolt and ensured Habsburg control for the next three hundred years.

It resulted in two centuries of recatholicization of the Czech lands and the decline of the Czech-speaking aristocracy and elite as well as the Czech language.

Czech view of history

by Emil Daniels

Dr. Edouard Beneš. Lecturer in Sociology at the Czech University in Prague. General Secretary of the Czecho-Slovak National Council in Paris. Ect. With an introduction by Henry Wickham Steed. London. George Allen and Union. 1917. ¹⁾

The author of this book is now the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Czechoslovak Republic. It is purposeful and well written, and one sees in it, as in a mirror, the view that the newly created Czechoslovak nation has of its history. As we will see for ourselves, this historical view appears to be highly contestable from the German point of view. Nevertheless, we have every reason to take careful note of the political and historical opinions of our new border neighbours in the southeast. For even one-sided and limited ideas are a spiritual power in the life of nations, if the people only believe in them.

Benes claims that in twelve centuries the Czech people have only ever wanted peace, but in every historical period they have been attacked again by the Germans: "With great difficulty they defended themselves and only by a miracle did they escape the fate of their unfortunate Slavic brothers on the Elbe.

You can see that Benes has no sense of the complicated nature of historical events. He seeks all guilt on the one hand, all justice and any virtue at all on the other. He cannot do enough in his disparagement of the German national character. And this lack of objectivity is documented not only in the passing of judgment, but also in the establishment of facts. In particular, the historical facts he conceals show how subjectively Benes writes history. From the seventh to the fourteenth century, he says, relations between the Germans and the Czechs were limited to the fact that the Czech kings thwarted the Germans' efforts to subjugate Bohemia; the Czechs then had to fight against the Germans, just as the southern Slavs later had to fight against the Turks. This comparison is as inaccurate as it is spiteful. In the epochs of the greatness of medieval German kingship, Bohemia received an infinite amount of good from Germany and very little evil, for the Dukes of Bohemia fitted into the framework of the Kingdom of Germany almost without resistance. The participation of Boleslaus, Duke of Bohemia, in the Battle of Lechfeld (955) is

telling proof of the good relations that existed between Germans and Czechs in those times. No less than a thousand Czechs are said to have been among the 8,000 warriors with whom Otto the Great defeated the Hungarians on the Lechfeld: "The Battle of Augsburg or on the Lechfeld", says H. Delbrück, "is the first German national battle against a foreign enemy . . ." The real idea of a German state only emerged with the new (Saxon) dynasty, which emancipated itself from the Franconian Empire as a whole, and the first battle in which this new state unity proved itself, in which warriors from all tribes worked together, was the victory over the Hungarians at Augsburg.

Without the Czech contingent, Otto (the Great) would hardly have been able to overcome the Magyars. The Czechs can therefore boast of having been present when the German state of the Middle Ages was founded. Its foundations were cemented not only with German, but also with Czech blood. At that time, Germanism and Czechness were morally united insofar as the Czechs had received the Christian faith and the Roman Church from Germany. Bohemian Christianity was born on January 7, 845, when fourteen noble Czechs and their entourage were baptized at the court camp of Louis the German in Regensburg, and at the same time Christian missionaries of German origin began to promote the Roman Church in Bohemia and Moravia. However, they encountered rivalry from another Christian nation. Cyril and Methodius had come from Constantinople. They tried to win the Czechs over to the Greek Church by using the Slavic language during church services. As the bishopric of Regensburg and its emissaries stuck to the Latin language, they had a difficult time against the Greek missionaries. If Regensburg was nevertheless victorious over Constantinople, it can be concluded from this how firmly Bohemia was already tied to Germany in the 9th and 10th centuries through the most diverse ties. In gratitude for his help on the Lechfeld, Emperor Otto I supported Duke Boleslav in his efforts to establish a bishopric in Prague. Pope John XIII agreed on the condition that only the Roman rite and the Latin language could be used for worship. The Bishop of Prague became a suffragan of the Archbishop of Mainz. The first Bishop of Prague was the Saxon Thietmar, and the second was Vojtuch, who came from a powerful Czech noble family, received his theological education in Magdeburg and here dropped the name Vojtuch in favour of the German Adalbert. Adalbert later left his episcopal see in Prague to convert the pagans in Prussia, suffered a martyr's death on the Baltic shore and was canonized by the Roman Church.

Benes makes no mention of this full and profound harmony of German and Czech tendencies, and just as little as he knows that the light of faith was kindled for the Czechs from Germany, he has no idea of the beneficial influence of medieval German culture on Bohemia. In those times, morality and the church were inextricably linked. We know how the monasteries in particular spread civilization as well as religion throughout Europe. For generations, the monks of Bohemia and Moravia came mainly from Germany; only gradually did Czechs also decide to join the regular clergy. Thus it was mainly German monks under whose leadership the vast primeval forests of the country were cleared, provided with roads and mule tracks and transformed into flourishing farmland. The mother monasteries in Germany arranged for the emigration of peasant colonists to Bohemia, who were more than willing to carry out the work that the still uncultivated Slavs were reluctant to do. However, it was not only the Catholic Church, which is cosmopolitan by nature, that favoured the emergence of German villages, but also the national dynasty of the Přemyslids ¹⁾. For every newly established village promised to increase the ruler's income. The mass settlement of German peasants broke the agrarian communism that prevailed in the Czech villages, which is still widespread today in Russia, a country related to their ancestors. The Czechs recognized that private peasant property, as their new compatriots had it, was a superior economic system to the "Mir" ²⁾ and gradually dissolved it by the 14th century. Almost all Czech peasant communities now lived, as they themselves called it, "according to German law".

1) The Přemyslid dynasty or House of Přemysl was a Bohemian royal dynasty that reigned in the Duchy of Bohemia and later Kingdom of Bohemia and Margraviate of Moravia (9th century –1306), as well as in parts of Poland (including Silesia), Hungary and Austria.

2) Mir - communal land ownership, a system later adopted by Russian serfs in the 19th century.

Almost more than through the elevation of the peasants, the Germans did Bohemia and Moravia credit by creating a flourishing town system in the 12th and 13th centuries. Czech historians themselves admit that the native tradesmen could not have accomplished this task due to their lack of freedom. The passionate Czech patriot Palacky says: "The Germans were accepted into the country by the kings of Bohemia primarily because of their industriousness. They also lived up to the trust placed in them and proved to

be extremely useful to the country, especially in mining and in clearing and reclaiming the many forests on the country's borders. It was thanks to them that the silver mines of Kuttenberg and Deutschbrod flourished, which had such a great influence on increasing the prosperity of the country and thus also the power of the state. It was for them and largely through them that the Bohemian bourgeoisie was created, and consequently also the commercial activity in the country was revitalized and elevated, and their settlements also indirectly gave rise to the emancipation of the peasants so eagerly pursued since Ottokar II. . ."

Should we consider it possible that Benes, in his overview of the history of Bohemia in the Middle Ages, does not even mention such an important element of the country's population as the Germans? Only when he comes to the Hussite Wars does he remark: "Then the Czechs began to fight the German settlers who had invaded the interior of their country and finally almost succeeded in liberating Bohemia from their presence. . . This is how the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Czechoslovak Republic judges the German Bohemians! They are a harmful foreign body, nothing more.

In truth, the Czechs of the Middle Ages had initially given themselves willingly and to the fullest extent to the German character and only very gradually developed a special national character. For centuries they had their churches and castles built by German artists; their nobility adopted the education and even the language of the knightly circles of Germany; German minstrels were honoured at the court of the Přemyslids but not Czech ones. However, there was also German hatred in Bohemia from the very beginning. In 1055, exactly one hundred years after the Battle of Lechfeld, Duke Spytihněv passed a law expelling all Germans, whether they had become Bohemian citizens, owned property or not. This ultra-radical measure, which expatriated the duke's own mother, was even more unenforceable under medieval conditions than it would be today. The policy which it seemed to inaugurate remained entirely without consequences; Bohemia grew ever closer to the German Empire. Joining other Czech historians, Benes takes the position that the medieval kings of Bohemia were not vassals of the German Empire, but merely had a duty to pay tribute to it. However, this is merely a dispute over words*). Tribute payment does not exclude feudal dependence. At least since Otto the Great, the kings of Germany have demonstrably had the right to enfeoff ¹⁾ the rulers of Bohemia at the beginning of their reign. The Bohemian princes appeared at our imperial diets and were obliged to follow the army, for example to provide 300 horsemen for Roman campaigns, which

was quite a considerable contingent by the standards of medieval warfare. From 1024, when the crown of Germany passed from the Saxon to the Frankish emperors, the rulers of Bohemia took part in the election of the German king. Under Emperor Henry V, they acquired the office of archduke in the empire. Benes and the Czech historians are quite mistaken when they claim that Czechity took considerable offense at the vassalage of the Bohemian sovereigns, as it was established "in the German manner by a handshake". Medieval states were far too loosely organized for national minorities to feel so easily oppressed. Opposition to the position of the King of Bohemia**) among the German electors did not come from the Czech side, where they probably felt more honoured, but from the Germans. In the 13th century, the *Sachsenspiegel* ²⁾ criticized the privileges of the kings of Bohemia because they were not German. But this nationalistic way of thinking did not prevail. The Bohemian kings not only retained the rights they had, but were even given first place among the secular electors.

*) Cf. Dr. Arnold Luschin von Ebengreuth, member of the Austrian House of Lords: "Grundriß der österreichischen Reichsgeschichte" („Outline of the Austrian imperial history“). Second improved and expanded edition. Bamberg 1918. pag. 170.

**) After individual Bohemian princes had already been recognized as kings by the Germans, the ducal dignity permanently gave way to the royal one from around 1200.

1) Enfeoff - (under the feudal system) to give freehold property or land in exchange for their pledged service.

2) The *Sachsenspiegel* is a law book written by The Saxon legal expert Eike von Repgow between 1220 and 1235.

So, whatever Benes may say to the contrary, from Louis the German to Charles IV, from the 9th to the 14th century, i.e. for half a millennium, the relationship between the German and Czech peoples was by and large peaceful and friendly. This changed when German immigration to Bohemia, which of course could not always continue with the same intensity, began to slow down around the year 1300 and Czechs moved in ever-increasing numbers from the flat countryside to the cities. Germanism began to stagnate, while Czechness entered the stage of national maturity. Now the language conflict began. Towards the end of his reign, Charles IV decreed that in the royal cities the exclusive use of the German language in the courts should cease and that from then on every alderman should be proficient in the Bohemian language.

The German Bohemians in the 14th century were as unwilling to comply with this order as they were at any time up to 1918 to allow equal rights for both national languages in predominantly German-speaking districts. This decree could only be implemented in some of the places. However, the Czech nationalist movement grew and culminated in the terrible Hussite uprising. Benes is enthusiastic about the Hussites: "They gave Europe the man who raised the fight for the freedom of individual conscience, Johann Huss. He was not only a religious reformer, he was also the initiator of the great philosophical movement that gave rise to the French Revolution and the foundation of modern philosophical and political individualism." These are nothing but grandiloquent phrases! Huss was a world-historical phenomenon that was deeply rooted in the Middle Ages and can only be explained from this milieu; he had nothing whatsoever to do with either the ideas of 1789 or modern individualism. Nor did Huss have the faintest idea of the thoughts and feelings that moved people politically in the 19th and 20th centuries. Just because he led the cause of one tribe against another, he cannot be characterized as a forerunner of the advocates of the principle of nationality. That would be too external and violent a judgment. Huss had even less to do with modern philosophy than with politics. He adhered to the school of realists, who fought with the nominalists, and thus stood firmly on the ground of scholasticism. And as far as Huss as a religious reformer is concerned, Ranke ¹⁾ has already shown in his "World History" *) that he was by no means Luther's equal.

1) Leopold von Ranke (1795 –1886) was a German historian and a founder of modern source-based history.

*) "Weltgeschichte" Volume IX, page 178 et seq.

Benes calls the most disastrous date in Czech history the year 1526, when the Habsburgs came to the Bohemian throne. This assertion is highly one-sided. If Bohemia and Austria had not come together in 1526, they would not have worked together to defend Vienna against the Turks in 1529. At that time, Vienna was defended by five regiments; four German and one Bohemian; the Bohemians stood from the Schottentor ¹⁾ to the red tower. The entire garrison numbered 16-17000 men. *) So it was a similar combination to that five to six centuries earlier at the gates of Augsburg, where Germans and Bohemians fought shoulder to shoulder to defend the religion and culture of the European West against the wild, pagan Magyars: "If Suleiman had conquered Vienna,"

says Ranke, "he would have known how to fortify it in such a way that it would not have been so easy to wrest it from him again. What a station it would have become for him to keep the entire Middle Danube region in suspense!"

1) Schottentor, a former city gate in the Vienna city wall, which was demolished in 1860.

*) Ranke: "Deutsche Geschichte im Zeitalter der Reformation" ("German History in the Age of the Reformation.") III, 143.

Only by uniting the forces of south-eastern Central Europe against the onslaught of the Ottomans under the Habsburgs was Bohemia saved from the fate that neighbouring Hungary suffered after the Battle of Mohacz of becoming a semi-Asiatic country. Benes is justifiably proud of Comenius ¹⁾ and the many other Czechs of wit and character who left their homeland after the Battle of the White Mountain in order to avoid having to renounce their Protestant faith. But it is beyond any doubt that this culture could not have flourished under Turkish rule.

1) John Amos Comenius (1592 – 1670) Czech philosopher, pedagogue and theologian who is considered the father of modern education.

It is therefore not true that the Habsburgs did nothing but evil to Bohemia. However, Niebuhr also judges that the Czech nation would have been morally killed by Liechtenstein's beatifiers. In this sense, the rebellion by means of which the Czechs, led by Benes and his comrades, brought down the Austro-Hungarian monarchy, which was beset by overpowering enemies, is the nemesis ¹⁾ of world history. The outrages of Ferdinand II's Counter-Reformation cried out to heaven. It is too much to say that ideas cannot be eradicated by force; this has succeeded many times in history, but never without pernicious consequences for the oppressor. According to human judgment, the Protestant religion has been eradicated forever in Bohemia, but Catholicism, which was forcibly imposed on the Bohemian people by dragoons, has achieved nothing morally that can be compared to Huss and Comenius. After all, the Bohemians who were made Catholic again were useful subjects of the House of Habsburg for centuries; one should therefore not take historical-philosophical idealism too far; brutality and intrigue are undoubtedly successful moral forces in history, but on the other hand it is

certain that the atrocities of the Bohemian Counter-Reformation did not remain unavenged. A deep resentment remained in the Czech people, which finally took on flesh and blood in various manifestations of Bohemian public life in the strongly anti-clerical Young Czech party and contributed greatly to the downfall of the monarchy.

1) In general usage, "nemesis" refers to a long-awaited, well-deserved, and often inevitable retribution or punishment for wrongdoing, or the agent or force that delivers it.

No greater error is possible, however, than to assume with Benes that the Czech Taborites, Utraquists and Lutherans had surpassed the Habsburg state in national tolerance. After the onset of the Hussite turmoil, the Bohemian Diet decided that the Czech language should be the sole language of negotiation for the estates, which until then had debated in a barbaric but nationally neutral Latin, just like the Hungarians. Furthermore, Czech was made the exclusive language of the courts. The Diet also decided that no German should be appointed to a state or municipal office of any kind if a Czech was suitable to fill the position. Finally, the Germans were forbidden to hold a castle. To use a modern catchphrase, they were no longer to be the subject but only the object of Bohemian legislation.

Thanks to the loose structure of the corporative state, the German Bohemians survived the persecution by the provincial diets of the 15th century just as well as the draconian law of Duke Svytihněv¹⁾ did, but their Czech compatriots were all the more bitterly hostile to them over the next two centuries. They, who according to Benes had always been the lambs against the German wolves, forced Emperor Matthias in 1615 to sign a downright scandalous language law that the Diet had made: "In this kingdom no one has ever known of any other than the Bohemian community", it says in the explanation of the law with that deliberate ambiguity with which the Czechs speak of "Bohemia", just as the Magyars speak of "Hungary". Then it is decreed that no person who does not know Czech may be naturalized; but even if a foreigner has acquired citizenship in a town after learning Czech, only his grandchildren should be granted the privileges of citizens. Where a German teacher or pastor was in office, he should always be succeeded by a Czech after his death. The nativist unreasonableness of the law culminated in the provision, which destroyed the freedom of association and assembly of the German Bohemians, that persons who had the audacity to use the German

language at their meetings were to be removed from the country within six months.

1) Spytihněv I (875 – 915), was Duke of Bohemia from 889. He appeared at the Imperial Diet (Reichstag) in Regensburg in 895. This was an important first step in detaching Bohemia from Moravian rule.

However this overflowing intolerance would hardly have done much harm to the Germans of Bohemia, as the law was never tested. A few years after its enactment, the Battle of the White Mountain took place. Now the central government in Vienna put an end to Bohemian independence. Linguistically, however, the German victors were very moderate. Ferdinand II's "Revised Provincial Order" of 1627 only decreed that the German language should have equal rights with Czech in the courts. This abolished linguistic tyranny, which had been practiced for two centuries in favour of the Czech idiom, for another three centuries. Whether it will be revived in the present, after the restoration of the Czech state, is one of the many questions about the future to which the peace treaties of Versailles and St. Germain prompt contemporaries and on whose reasonable answer the chances of a peaceful development of Europe depend.

Benes has by no means completely overlooked the fact that Austrian absolutism of the 17th, 18th and 19th centuries cannot be blamed for actual nationalist intolerance. Our author quite rightly says that basically there was no struggle of the Czech nationality against the House of Habsburg, but that on Bohemian soil, too, it was a matter of the great antagonisms between Protestantism and Catholicism, decaying autonomy of the estates and rising centralizing princely power, which divided the whole of Europe. But just as suddenly and abruptly as such sensible ideas sometimes appear in Benes' book, they also disappear again from the author's explanations. Helplessly, he falls back again and again into the barren, nationalistic fanaticism that permeates his writing and makes him incapable of an objective appreciation of the ideal content of Austrian history. It is true that the political earthquake of 1620 covered the soil of Bohemia with the ruins of Czech society. The place of the destroyed aristocratic and bourgeois upper classes was taken by a new society whose weal and woe depended on Vienna and which, for the most part immigrants or of German-Bohemian origin, used not the Czech but the German colloquial language. In the 17th and 18th centuries, Bohemia and

Moravia became countries in which only a few people spoke Slavic, even without any significant language constraints, almost simply due to changing circumstances. Czech had become a patois like Breton and Basque in today's France. Very few men still adhered to the Czech nationalist idea, not without incurring inconvenience from the government. And yet Benes is very much mistaken in his sentiments when he abhors the memory of all Habsburgs who have ruled Bohemia since Ferdinand II. Heinrich von Treitschke once said that if Frederick the Great had succeeded with his plans to conquer Bohemia in the Second Silesian War, the country would probably still have been Germanized. Maria Theresa saved Czechoslovakia from this by uniting all the forces of her states against Prussia, as Charles V and Ferdinand I once did against the Ottomans under Soliman the Great. If Maria Theresa had not been Queen of Bohemia, Benes would perhaps be a Prussian Hakatist ¹⁾ today.

1) The word Hakatist comes from the acronym Hakata or H-K-T after von Hansemann, Kennemann and von Tiedemann who were the founders of the "Association for the promotion of German language in Eastern Marken" otherwise known as the "German Eastern Marches Society". The Eastern Marches was a district consisting of the Eastern provinces of Prussia, formally Polish. Similarly to the Northern Marches the word March (or Mark or margraviate) comes from Margrave which was the title for the military commander assigned to maintain the defence of one of the border provinces of the Holy Roman Empire.

As far as internal progress is concerned, Bohemia and Moravia also owe the greatest debt of gratitude to the dynasty they have just dethroned. Bohemia, Moravia, Carniola and Galicia are the only Slavic countries to have experienced the influence of enlightened despotism to any great extent. It never really reached Russia; the Polish parts of the country that were subjected to the officialdom of the Friderician school in 1793 and 1795 did not belong long enough to the old Prussian state; only old Austria had enough strength and time to expose its Slavs thoroughly to the influence of bureaucratic rationalism. And truly, the Austrian Slavs needed the reforms that followed the centralization of states and the establishment of absolute governments throughout continental Europe like bread! The times in which the Bohemian-Slavic peasantry had progressed, adapting to the example of the immigrant German peasants, were centuries ago. Since then, agricultural development had long since come to a standstill and the Czech peasants, like the Slavs in general, were still in a state of serfdom. These backward social conditions could not last forever because, as Count Kaunitz remarked to the Bohemian estates: "The true strength of the state lies in the greatest part of the people,

namely in the common man, and this deserves the greatest consideration, but is more oppressed in Bohemia than in other countries *).

*) Dr. Franz Martin Mayer: "Geschichte Oesterreichs mit besonderer Rücksicht auf das Kulturleben" („The history of Austria with special regard to cultural life“) 3rd edition, II, 452, Vienna and Leipzig. Wilhelm Braumüller. 1909.

After long and patient preparatory work by his mother's government, Joseph II abolished serfdom. In addition, there were other reforms of enlightened despotism in the areas of education, worship, justice and all branches of welfare policy in general. Benes ignores all these achievements. He rails against Maria Theresa's internal policy, which restricted the independence of the outdated Bohemian feudal estates even more severely than her predecessors, as "illegal and unwarranted". Before becoming Minister of Foreign Affairs, Benes lectured in sociology at the Czech University in Prague. Unlike the dry discipline of history, sociology prides itself on being a science of living life. For this reason, a sociologist should never fall into the kind of arid formalism that Beneš displayed in his criticism of Maria Theresa's state administration. A glance at Poland could have taught him that it is a fantastically arbitrary historical judgment when he tacitly assumes that an independent Czech state of the 18th century could have solved the problems of administrative and social reform posed by the Age of Enlightenment just as well or better than the government in Vienna. If an independent Czech state had been able to survive at all alongside the rising Prussian superpower, it would hardly have become more than a fifth or sixth variety of Eastern Europeanism alongside Russia, Poland, Hungary, Moldavia and Wallachia. With a painful but powerful jolt, the Habsburgs oriented Bohemia towards the west. Without this precondition, the country would hardly have flourished as it does today and perhaps Galician or Hungarian conditions would have prevailed on the Vltava and upper Elbe.

In all European countries where there was a nobility at all, it participated energetically in the national movements of the 19th century. The achievements of the Polish, Hungarian and Italian nobility in this respect are generally known. For reasons that historians can easily explain, the German nobility remained somewhat more reserved, but a true Junker ultimately realized the German dream of unity, and he was by no means the only member of his class whose efforts were needed to bring the national state into being. In Bohemia, however, the course of events was quite different. Here, the aristocracy may

have occasionally patronized the Czech national idea, but it never really took it under its wing. Nor could it do so. Partly, it was German; partly, like the officer corps of the old Imperial and Royal Army, it belonged to none of the rival ethnic groups, but considered itself, to use Th. von Bernhardi's ¹⁾ words, part of the "Austrian nationality." A large part of the Bohemian aristocracy, namely the owners of the *Latifundia* (landed estates), owed their fortune to the confiscation of Lutheran property, which the imperial government had ordered after the defeat of the Czechs on the White Mountain. These historical facts continue to have an effect in Bohemia to this day, as they do in Ireland. The lack of any aristocratic element in the present composition as well as in the history of the Czech party exerts a very detrimental influence on its mentality. The party, in which the urban and rural petty bourgeoisie is spreading, is rabid, petty and limited. It is as if their feelings were still strongly affected by the experiences of one of the first originators of the Czech national movement, the creator of the New Bohemian vocabulary and literature, Josef Jungmann, who lived in an aristocratic home. Jungmann, the son of a poor farmer, was a tutor in the house of Baron Lexa von Ahrenthal in 1798. He was treated very kindly there, but it irritated him that, when guests were at table, silver cutlery was laid out for everyone, only the courtier was given a lead knife and fork and a tin spoon. His inner man rebelled against this social differentiation, and he dismissed Baron Ahrenthal from his position, also very kindly, but as soon as possible.

1) Bernhardi, Theodor von, 1802-1885 was a German diplomat and historian.

Jungmann's behaviour is symbolic of the entire Czech party to this day. Social sensitivity has contributed greatly to its rise. There are far too many people among its leaders who are used to eating with tin spoons. However, silver spoons are not always associated with a wider circle of views, as can be seen from the aristocratic matadors of the Italian, Polish and Hungarian democracies.

To return to Benes' view of history, his attempt to prove that the Germans and the Habsburgs have only ever wronged the Czechs and brought disaster becomes all the more hopeless the closer his historical overview approaches the times in which we live. Of Emperor Joseph II he once grumpily admits that he had endeavoured to serve his people. Just as he does not deny the immense importance of Luther for Czech intellectual life in the 16th and 17th centuries, he also admits, albeit with a certain degree of concealment, that the

restoration of Czech national consciousness by Jungmann, Dombrowsky, Pelzel, Šafařík, Palacký and others cannot be understood without the stream of thought emanating from Herder. On the other hand, Benes has not the slightest understanding of the difficulties the House of Habsburg had to struggle with in the 19th and 20th centuries when it wanted to balance the intersecting claims of the nationalities it ruled to some extent. Benes casts doubt on Franz Joseph's good will and wants to see nothing in this monarch's policy towards the Czechs but dynastic selfishness, a mad Greater-German - I almost wrote Pan-German - fantasy, hatred of the Slavs and disloyalty. At the same time, however, he draws up a description of the situation of the Czechs between 1879 and 1914, from which it emerges what we already know from a thousand other sources, that Emperor Franz Josef, whom he describes as a vile and perfidious tyrant, must have been a very mild and loyal ruler. With comfortable cynicism, Benes admits: "During the last thirty years, the Czechs adopted a new political tactic; instead of open rebellion, they silently prepared for more favourable days. They worked on their economic development, on increasing their political influence. Step by step, they occupied important positions in the administration and gained new rights for the benefit of their language and schools. They strengthened local autonomy and improved public education. Very successful in this new campaign, they also vigorously resisted the pretensions of the Germans and Magyars to have the entire internal organization of the monarchy in their hands. . . ."

"Why the leaders of such a splendidly flourishing tribe incited them to such an extent that the regiments recruited from them went over to the enemy in droves during the war - Benes boasts that, together with the other Czech leaders, he thereby disorganized the entire Austro-Hungarian army - is not explained to us by our author. We find the explanation in the thoughtful and subtle pamphlet by Berthold Molden: "Die Politik der Besiegten *)" (The Politics of the Defeated), which states: "Austria was a state in which the Slavic peoples could live as such, develop and rise higher . . . In Austria (if the war had not been lost), the idea of national autonomy would have prevailed against the resistance of the Czechs, who stubbornly clung to Bohemian constitutional law, which for them meant rule over the Germans of Bohemia, Moravia and Silesia, despite all its twists and turns.

*) A. Edlingers Publishers, Vienna and Leipzig, 1919 The brochure was published at the beginning of that year. It is a valuable source for studying the mood

in German-Austria at the time, which was still relatively optimistic about the future and had no idea of the horrors to come.

This is the judgment of an expert who is close to the matter because he himself comes from the lands of the Crown of Saint Wenceslas (the Bohemian Crown Jewels) and who, thanks to his genuine and solid education, is nevertheless able to gain the objectivity necessary for an impartial judgment. The Czechs did not want to enjoy equal rights; that was not enough for them; they wanted to rule, to rule over the other nationality in their lands and, last but not least, over the social groups that eat with silver spoons! Benes failed to recognize this, despite being a sociologist!

A few years ago, I reviewed a Polish book in these papers which presented the Poles' view of history in just as chauvinistic a manner as Benes did that of the Czechs. Chauvinism must exist, and we Germans have just as little reason as the Slavs for pharisaical self-righteousness with regard to our Hakatist and all-German fellow citizens. Today, however, the preservation of the remnants of European culture and its consolidation depend on the emergence of moral forces on all sides which counter the historical fabrications of the nationalist zealots with purer and deeper views of the historical past. We hope that such men will also appear in Comenius' homeland. The Russians say contemptuously of the Czechs that they are not really Slavs at all, but only Slavic-speaking Germans. Conversely, one of our most ardent patriots, Heinrich von Treitschke, called the Czechs the most gifted of all Slavic tribes. There are therefore ideal ties between Germany and Czechoslovakia that bind the two peoples together, over and above the economic relations that are rightly emphasized. The hereditary enmity, which Benes presents as the natural relationship between Germans and Czechs, is in reality only one side of a relationship which by its very nature is bipolar. It is true that in the course of their history the Czechs have often felt repelled by Germanism; they have undoubtedly been more anti-German than the Poles; but on the other hand they have also fraternized with us against Magyars, Turks and the Napoleonic empire and have taken their entire world of thought from Germany, from Christian doctrine to Herder's *Voices of the Nations*. As far as the Germans are concerned, they have allowed the doctrines of Huss and Comenius to affect them without asking about the origins of their authors; hatred of the Czechs has always been unknown in Germany. Now that the Czechs, by an unheard-of favor of fate, have regained the supremacy over the Germans of the Sudetenland that they lost in the 17th century, this decision is regarded everywhere in the German-speaking area as a judgment of God to

which our nation must bow, albeit with strong inner reluctance. It would only be possible to create a mood among the Germans for a revolt against this historical fact under two conditions: either if the young Czechoslovak Republic pursued an unprovoked policy hostile to Germany, or if, in the spirit of Beneš's writing, it attempted with regard to the German Bohemians: "To liberate Bohemia from their presence. For in the era of national ideas, no nation forgives the sacrilege of its own flesh and blood.

* * *

Russia and Europe

by Dr. Walther Schotte *)

The World War has profoundly confused the political riddle of witchcraft, forcing us to calculate almost entirely with unknown quantities, each of which is insoluble and can therefore only be understood in its relationship. Russia is quite sphinx-like, and the question of the relationship between Russia and Europe, or between Russia and Germany, is quite obscure. To understand this, we must consider the grouping of the non-European powers, the relationships, and the tensions among the newly emerging or changing major agents of global political development in general.

*) Lecture given at the Russian-German Society on March 2, 1920.

It would be permissible to separate these agents into those that are considered as subjects of politics and those that are considered as objects of politics. For a long time in the 19th century, there were only two main subjects of "Great Politics": the English and Russian empires. The object of their dispute was Asia, actually China. The preservation of this country as an area of the "open door" territory meant its domination by England as long as England had a monopoly on world trade and naval supremacy. When Germany moved from being a secondary to a primary agent in politics, the hitherto stable Russian-English tension began to tremble, triggering further movements: the Anglo-Japanese alliance, England's attempts to make a pact with Germany, the Russo-Japanese war, the temporary understanding between England and a weakened Russia, the encirclement of Germany, against which all movements finally collided centripetally, until the deluge of the world war wiped out the newest force on the scale of world politics. Is it not almost correct to say that the origin of the world war came from China? -

The World War has changed the great equations considerably. Instead of the old empire of the English global power, the new one of the Anglo-Saxon corporation will one day have to be substituted; in place of Russia, Japan is emerging as the subject of politics; and the disputed object of politics today is no longer China alone, Russia and Germany have been reduced from subjects to objects, Russia and Central Europe have been Chineseized! Northern, Western and Mediterranean powers of continental Europe are forced to live as

satellites of Anglo-Saxonism until - Russia and Germany will cease to be objects, i.e. " open-door territories ," and thus a monopoly for the Anglo-Saxon world power.

The peace treaty has made us an "open-door territory"*); that is the meaning of all the provisions on the enforced unilateral most-favoured-nation treatment, the de-sovereignization of our customs and transit policy, the internationalization of the waterways and the control of our tax policy by the Commission des réparations. Russia, however, is in the same position, due to the revolutionary destruction of its entire organization. The peace treaties concluded, and certainly the treaties which England is now endeavoring to conclude with Russia and the peripheral states, are therefore in no way comparable with the inter-European treaties of history, but only with those treaties which European powers have concluded with and about China, especially with the last European-Chinese treaty which ended the so-called Boxer War. The extent to which this peace was a model for that of Versailles becomes shockingly clear in view of the fact that even the "extradition of the guilty" to the court of the victors was adopted as a treaty point from the Boxer Peace. With what sadistic elation Clemenceau-Lloyd George may have savoured this "Chineseization" of the same Germany that was the "author" of such a treaty manipulation in 1901! That's by the way. -

*) This character of the Peace of Versailles will be clarified in greater detail in a comprehensive work by Dr. Riedl through in-depth analyses of the individual political and economic peace conditions and their comparison with the international pacts on open-door territories.

The "global balance" today is composed—as it always has been—of three agents, two subjects and one object of politics, only that different forces than in the past have taken over the functions, other forces that have significantly shifted the entire global political game. Whereas in the past Russia and England were roughly equivalent for a long time and the tension was stable, today the tension is extremely unstable; the forces are unequal and by no means consolidated and formed within themselves. Therefore, the relationships of the two agents to the object of politics, and therefore Japan's relationship to the Asian-Central European continent, are quite different from that of the Anglo-Saxon world. Japan will always be relatively small and weak compared to the Anglo-Saxon state corporations; a simple paralysis of these corporations by a Japanese-Chinese one is not feasible for various reasons, -

China must remain the object of politics for Japan as well, admittedly a monopoly for Japan, which will be the only master in the yellow world or not at all. Japan has a greater interest in Russia and Germany in awakening their political will to a new level than in enriching itself by exploiting them as weak-willed people, which must be the natural policy of the Anglo-Saxon world power.

However, it would be wrong to believe that Japan will take up its natural policy towards Russia-Central Europe very urgently today or even make it noticeable. Certainly not towards Germany. For in this way Japan would first of all accomplish that the consolidation of the Anglo-Saxon trust would be accelerated, that England would immediately translate into practical policy the result of the World War, which today is only formulated in principle, its consolidation with America, whereas without provoking England this process would proceed relatively slowly, very much in the interest of Japan's consolidation, held up by political chauvinism and economic rivalries on both sides. The Anglo-American alliance can no longer be prevented! Nothing can herald its coming more clearly than the organization of the League of Nations provided for in the peace treaty, which is of course nothing other than the constitution imposed on the world by Anglo-Saxonism, through which it is to be governed "legally" and with its own cooperation by Anglo-Saxons. But it is not this character of the League of Nations that interests us in this connection, but rather its organizational provisions, which reveal the secret of the future grouping of the English Empire with the United States of America.

A superficial examination of the provisions in question might make it appear that the League of Nations was a purely English institution. The "original members" of the League of Nations, who unite in the democratically formed Federal Assembly, which grants each member only one equal vote, also include five fully self-governing dominions or "colonies" in addition to the English mother country: Canada, Australia, South Africa, New Zealand, India, so that the British Empire could be regarded as represented by six votes! This circumstance would be all the more significant as the powers of the "Assembly" and the "High Council", consisting of nine representatives, are by no means clearly defined, so that England would have it in her power to drag important questions before the forum of the Federal Assembly, which is more convenient to her, and to allow her sixfold voting power to take effect here. But anyone familiar with the history of the English empire must know that the allocation of votes to the dominions and colonies means first and foremost a victory of the colonies over the English mother country. I do not by any means

think it impossible that Lloyd George and the English government will flatter themselves that they will have the moral advantage over the colonies for a long time to come, that they will be able to make them submissive to the English will. But how long will this continue to be the case in general, e.g. with Canada or the Australian colonies, for example in the event of an American-Japanese conflict? No, then these colonies will go with the United States and the mother country will have to follow. The United States began the emancipation from London 150 years ago, and it is again the United States that is politically closing the ring of Anglo-Saxon states. Without the certain prospect that the five votes of the Dominions would belong as much to Washington as to London, Wilson would never have agreed to this arrangement of membership. Do we know, then, whether he might not have supported the colonies in this demand? After all, the result was a victory for America over England, a victory for all the colonies over the mother country. The British empire is finally decentralized, the main points shift; New York-Chicago are now the stock exchanges of the world, no longer London. And constant contact between Wall Street and the White House will have to balance Anglo-Saxon world politics; there will no longer be an exclusively British world politics. The fact that Wilson's "victory" is difficult for American public opinion to grasp does not change this outcome. Certainly the rivalries will continue, but gradually they will no longer appear as foreign policy rivalries, but only as domestic economic ones, which a politician may be able to exploit tactically. A strategy that counts on a foreign policy, a global political opposition to England and America will ultimately be doomed to defeat. Particularly in relation to Russia, the economic contrast between England and America cannot be without a useful, and incidentally piquant, effect for Europe. But politically Anglo-Saxonism is united, even when Russia is spoken of; and if at any time or place the Anglo-Saxon states should not be quite clearly aware of this, the Japanese antagonist of world history is on the scene and will force them to show solidarity.

* * *

This outlines the global political framework in which the picture that will shake us must be seen: Russia and Europe! Let us now look at the problem in isolation for a moment.

With what expectations, what feelings do the peoples of exhausted Europe turn to the future that is to come to them from the fairy-tale land of Russia! What are not the hopes of the famished at this very moment! Food and raw

materials, grain, meat and fats, wood, cotton and ores - all the goods of which there is a terrible shortage all over Europe, especially in overpowered Central Europe. Whether we hear Germany or Poland or Czecho-Slovakia or German-Austria, the Balkan peoples and even Italy, - everywhere we hear the cry of distress that peace must now be made with Russia, no matter whether with a Bolshevik or a bourgeois Russia; one can wait no longer; the scales of fate have obviously tilted definitively in favour of the Bolsheviks, so Bolshevik Russia is to become the saviour of the starving and impoverished center of Europe. That is what Russia is to do! Indeed, even more than that; France and England and the United States are also crowding in on its marvels.

But what is the reality? Not even the prosperous Russia of 1914 would have been able to cope with the kind of European hardship that afflicts us today. The old, prosperous Russia, despite all its abundance, had temporary or localized famines which it was unable to remedy. Its organization was primitive and in any case too weak to satisfy this gigantic empire evenly. The Siberian surpluses would of course have sufficed to compensate for temporary or local shortages in European Russia; but the railroad network, the one Siberian railroad, was not efficient enough to roll in the necessary transports. Old Russia was only at the beginning of its development; it could not yet make the use of its wealth that would have been necessary even then for reasons of state economy; its surpluses essentially served only to satisfy the German consumer; the labour output of old Russia was still far too low to supply the world. But today, Bolshevik Russia, destroyed by war and revolution, is supposed to perform this miracle? That is quite out of the question! All expectations of obtaining food and raw materials from Bolshevik Russia will be bitterly disappointed; not even the force of the European profiteers will be able to wrest from the unhappy country goods which it cannot do without itself. If the Soviet government holds out hope to the European states for the supply of foodstuffs and raw materials, we must describe this procedure as a deliberate deception. A democratic Russia, with the establishment of order, the security of property, the guarantee of trade, the resumption of entrepreneurial work and the re-establishment of transportation, could very gradually provide goods for export, but not in a quantity corresponding to the hunger of Europe. After all, every influx of goods, however modest, must be perceived by all of us as great blessing and must therefore be pursued by all means. For this reason, there can be no question as to whether we should negotiate and live with a Bolshevik or a democratic Russia; democratic Russia is Europe's only salvation as far as the procurement of goods from Russia is concerned, albeit a very slow one. This assertion must be substantiated in more detail in view of

the fantastic hopes that the governments and masses of old Europe have for Russia.

If the Soviet power were in a position, even if it were only able in terms of power politics, to extract goods for export from the country's economy and make them available, then it would also have been able to solve the bitterly necessary task of maintaining its power by at least supplying the capital cities of its own country with sufficient provisions. But what is the situation in Moscow and Petersburg and other major Russian cities? I have before me a list of the surreptitious prices paid in Moscow in January for those foodstuffs that were to be given on cards but could not be obtained. It cost

Sugar	1000	Rubles per pound		
Butter	1400	"	"	"
Pork	680	"	"	"
Beef	380	"	"	"
Horse meat	300	"	"	"
Dog meat	90	"	"	"
Bread	200	"	"	"
Potatoes and carrots	50	"	"	"

A pair of galoshes costs 2500 rubles, a cord of wood 1400 rubles, a ride in a cab from the city center to the train station 800 rubles. All the wooden fences have been torn down and used as firewood; the streetcars no longer run, the lighting is extremely poor, the factories are at a standstill due to a lack of raw materials and heating. Coffins are no longer available. The corpses are wrapped in rags and cremated, the few coffins that are in use are rented out for the transportation of corpses.

In the course of January, only six $\frac{3}{4}$ pound portions of bread could actually be distributed to the first class of the population, the workers and state employees. The bourgeoisie is condemned to starvation; the mortality rate among the population would amount to over 40% per year if the present state of affairs were to continue. Under these circumstances it is understandable that the rule of the Soviets can only be maintained by bloody force. If recently the number of daily murders committed by the notorious commissariats for the suppression of the counter-revolution has decreased a little, the only reason is that the population is too exhausted to resist and conspire.

The tyranny of the Soviets is limited to the centers of the large cities, the railroad network and the army's operational areas. Along the railroads it is of

course possible to use military force to compel the peasants to hand over bread and cattle; but the quantities of food obtained are by no means sufficient to supply the cities. In the middle of the deep country the dictatorship of the Soviets is failing. Russia's transportation system is undeveloped and at the moment almost completely destroyed. This means that there is no basis for an organization that would dominate the country politically and economically. If, therefore, the provisioning of Russian cities fails, how can one hope to supply Europe from Russia with the help of Soviet power? The Soviet power has no other means at its disposal than its inadequate force; money is completely devalued and is not accepted by the rural population, which looks only to objects of daily use and is prepared to exchange these for food. For barter trade, however, it would be necessary to restore individualistic forms of economy, free trade and entrepreneurship, which a Soviet government would hardly be able to bring itself to do, since it would thereby lay the axe to the very roots of its economic and social organization.

If further proof were needed of the hopelessness of obtaining any goods from Soviet Russia, let us recall the experience we had with the "bread peace" of Brest-Litovsk and the attempts to improve our wartime plight through supplies from the Ukraine (which was under our control!). Certainly, our military and occupation authorities made technical mistakes in the administration of the country and in their dealings with the peasantry; but these mistakes alone are not the reason why we received virtually nothing from the Ukraine in 1918. Even then, the reason was the plight of the technical transportation system, which could only have been improved very gradually in order to get the country's economy and exports going. If Europe does not decide to help re-establish civil order, transportation and trade in Russia, the day when the first goods will arrive from Russia in the form of regular exports will be postponed further and further into the future.

But instead of cooperating in its overthrow, some European governments are preparing to negotiate with the Soviet power for its recognition, the establishment of diplomatic relations, the restoration of international trade and economic exchange, and are thus themselves helping to prolong the misfortunes of Bolshevism. We shall have to take a closer look at the relationship of the individual European governments towards Russia. At this point we want to deal with the actions of the Central European governments, especially those of Germany, Poland and Czecho-Slovakia, for which those economic-political illusions and the sympathies of non-localized masses for the socialist ideal of the future, which Bolshevism claims to have realized,

seem to be decisive. These negotiations will therefore not only fail to serve the purpose of opening up a raw material country, but they also directly evoke for Central Europe the foreign policy danger of Bolshevism and that of internal Bolshevization. It is wrong to believe that Bolshevism will be able to renounce the state of war and live in permanent international peace. The Russian tyranny can only maintain its equilibrium by the constant exertion of its military forces. If the government is prepared at the present moment to enter into peace negotiations with the European powers, the reason for this is none other than to gain time to put the destroyed organization, especially of transport, at least for the conduct of the war, in a makeshift manner, and perhaps to use the help of the deceived foreign countries, from which machines are required, for this task. As soon as the strengthening of the Bolshevik power, as well as the traffic conditions and the season of the year, should again permit military action, the path of war will of necessity be trodden again. It will be all the more successful if, in the meantime, the enemy's resistance has been weakened or even broken by the Bolshevik revolution. But what will happen if Soviet Russia sets out for military conquest in the direction of the weakest resistance, i.e. against Poland? All those familiar with the Polish situation expect Poland to succumb to a Bolshevik attack. It is true that the Polish army is not actually bad. There is a nationalist spirit in it, and in normal times it is held together by a reasonable discipline. But the army is in no way equipped for major military operations, so that its defensive strength is doubtful. But this strength will certainly collapse if the revolution flares up behind the army. Now the Bolshevik propaganda in the economically impoverished, poorly organized country has made such progress that the outbreak of Bolshevik revolutions in Warsaw and in the industrial region is almost inevitable in the event of an attack from outside. We Germans should not lull ourselves into a false sense of security that Poland can protect us. As much as some of us would like to welcome the collapse of Polish power for other reasons, this event can be highly disastrous for our own security if the onrushing Bolshevism is the victor over Poland. After the defeat of Poland, the Bolshevik armies may one day stand directly on the borders of Germany. On the borders of Germany, that is, two hours by rail (130 km!) from Berlin, that is, in front of the Upper Silesian industrial area, which is no longer entirely under our control, on the borders of Lower Silesia, the Neumark and Pomerania, which have become border provinces since the Treaty of Versailles. For East Prussia will have long since become a storm-tossed island in a Bolshevik sea! The Bolshevik will first declare that he is not coming as an enemy. But he will give us the ultimatum that we should

Bolshevize ourselves, make common cause with him against the Western powers. But can we bolshevize ourselves? Is the communist form of existence even conceivable or feasible for Germany?

* * *

Western Europe and Germany live in the social and economic forms of advanced capitalism, an international organization based on the world division of labour. None of the state members of this capitalist world system can be detached from the system without the whole being shaken, itself and others being dragged into ruin. The war has taught us that! But what people, even social politicians by profession, have not yet understood is the relationship that exists between the quantity and density of a population and the economic and social forms in and of themselves, such that a certain density of the population is only possible, bearable and maintainable with and through a certain form of organization of society and economy. Therefore, one cannot change the realities of social and economic forms by changing the idealistic attitude if one is not in a position to change the preconditions or conditions of the existing social and economic forms, i.e. the quantities and densities of the populations, the ratio of the number of consumers to the given natural resources of the country. Communism presupposes a certain harmony between the goods and forces of the soil and the number of people who live from it; for it eliminates trade, it eliminates the international division of labour, it thus eliminates the commodity-producing labour of the individual; it demands a certain self-sufficiency of the individual local districts of life. Capitalism, however, allows a larger and denser multitude of people to live there than the forces of any one country are able to feed themselves, thanks to the goods-producing labour of the individual, thanks to the international conversion of these goods through trade, thanks to the compensation in goods that has arisen in the international division of labour and serves to satisfy needs that either cannot be met at all or cannot be sufficiently met locally. In the final analysis, therefore, capitalism has created the density of our Western European population in the first place, and this density would have to disappear again, a depopulation would have to occur, if the garment of communism were to fit our national body.

Unfortunately, it cannot be said that this depopulation of old Europe is beyond all the possibilities of history; wars, revolutions, famine have made a bad beginning, Bolshevism would complete the devil's work with murder, destruction of culture and epidemics that follow in its wake! And the ground has long been prepared for Bolshevik madness in the terrible disruption that

the war has brought to the world's capitalist system. Very few people still have a correct idea of the extent and significance of this disruption, because the connections between population density and the organizational forms of social and economic life are not sufficiently known, because nowhere is it understood how the population increase of the 19th century changed all relationships among people, political, social, economic, spatial and temporal. Not even this fact of exceptional population growth in the 19th century has been recognized as the actual, the main event of this century. Yet it has such a phenomenal effect, changing all rhythms, all tempos, all spatial relations of history, that a new age of history should be reckoned with the beginning of these developments in population increase. Until this beginning, population growth remained constant and relatively low compared to that of the 19th century. For if one takes whatever period of time is assumed for the history of the Christian Germanic-Romanic family of peoples, from Caesar's time to the migration of peoples, from it to the Crusades, again to the Reformation and further, if one measures the increase in population as a percentage for the century, one will always find that the increase is constant and even on the whole and can be given as 10 to 20 %. So up to 1750, 1780 or 1800! For example

Germany (within the borders of 1914) had about 5-6 million people after the migration of peoples, about 12 million around 1300; in 1620 its population was estimated at 15 million souls; in 1720 it was about 16, in 1750 about 17, in 1800 finally 22-24 million people. 1910: 66 million!

England and Wales grew steadily from 1500 to 1800 from 1½, 2, 2½ million souls up to 9 million. 1905: 32.5 million!

Italy counted around 1200: 6 million; 1560 about 11; 1788 over 16; then 1901: 32.5 million!

France: under Charlemagne about 8 million inhabitants; in 1574 about 14; 1700: 21; 1715: 18; 1789: 26; 1806: 29; then in 1901: 39 million inhabitants!

Of course, there are considerable fluctuations that can only be called small *sub specie aeternitatis* ¹⁾. There are happy times when populations grow, swell, more than the earth actually has room for or can provide enough goods to feed the people. Then come wars and epidemics, and they act like valves to release air. This was the effect of the Black Death in the 14th century, especially in France and Germany, the Thirty Years' War, the wars of Louis XIV in France!

1) Sub specie aeternitatis – "under the aspect of eternity".

But - to repeat - overall, the population increase is steady, remaining the same in percentage terms through all eighteen centuries, until the 19th century makes this giant leap: population increases of 200, even 300 percent! The reason for this is seen in the invention of the machine, in the achievements of technology, which made this growth possible in the first place. Certainly, that is correct; but this explanation is that of a crudely materialistic view of history that does not know how to distinguish between the secret interactions of cause and effect in history. By the way, when was the first railroad built in Germany? 1839! The one from Nuremberg to Fürth. But the new population growth began as early as 1780, increasing in percentage terms from year to year. In any case, by 1820 it was already around fifty percent (calculated over a century). Let's say it out loud: A new age begins with the emancipation of the European bourgeoisie! At the same time, a new society is being formed everywhere in old Europe, almost throwing off the old social and intellectual shackles, creating a new culture: that of Voltaire and Lessing, Hume and Kant and Goethe! And from this European bourgeoisie the modern entrepreneur finally emerges, first as a merchant, then as an industrialist. Modern, capitalist, commodity-potentiating work sets in; work that creates new space for new people with new goods! In the first half of the 19th century there was again a danger that the earth was not big enough; one remembers the great price crises of the 30s, the price rises, which are always an expression of relative poverty of goods. But instead of brute force through war and pestilence, we were saved by the technical genius of the new humanity, which invented the steam engine and the locomotive. Now the way was clear for the development of modern capitalism, which until then had always been hampered. What tremendous consequences! In time and space the picture of the world was changed; the earth seemed small, for all distances shrank in importance; the earth seemed large, for the same space was not too narrow for a hundredfold humanity. A route like the one from Berlin to Munich, which once took ten days, was covered by the D-train in just twelve hours. And on the other hand, a city of five million people, whether in France, Germany or England, would have been completely unthinkable before 1800. After all, what would five million people in Berlin, for example, have lived on? From the fruits of the barren sandy soil of the Mark ¹⁾, which without steam ploughs and artificial fertilizers once barely yielded half of what it does today? The flourishing, lively cosmopolitan city of 1914, however, lived from the goods of the whole world: Russia worked to supply its meat and fat and eggs, fruit and canned food came from the Mediterranean countries and America, and the people of these German

cities wore clothes, only the smallest part of which were made of fabrics whose raw materials were produced by the local soil and agriculture. All the tempos of life changed in this new era. We did not know that either. We did not know that three or four or even five years of war would be more disastrous for society and the economy today than the thirty years of war in the 17th century.

1) Here the word "Mark" denotes the region of Westfalen, a province of Prussia.

Why is that? Because, given the density of the population, it is so dependent on one another, so interconnected, indeed so interwoven through the widespread process of division of labour, that any disruption of these connections, artificial and violent separations and severances will render the isolated part incapable of survival in a very short time and bring about catastrophes for the whole. We recognize the truth of this fact just as well in the misfortune of the war economy, the effect of the economic war, as in the economic consequences of the political border provisions of the peace treaty. The dictators of Versailles should have been aware of the difference between the times, should have known that today it is no longer possible to make peace and reorganize the world in the style of Napoleon. Napoleon could still arbitrarily create and destroy states; he drew a Grand Duchy of Würzburg, a Grand Duchy of Frankfurt, a Grand Duchy of Berg on the map with the pencil, and by his will these states were there and lived. If a wall had been erected around the Grand Duchy of Würzburg, forbidding all entry and exit, the people within the wall would not have starved, been ragged and without work. But today such an isolated area of Germany would have to perish, i.e. so many of its inhabitants would have to die until the rest could feed and clothe themselves from the yield of the soil. For the others all live on the goods which they acquire within the international division of labour.

The international division of labour, which until the war was only automatic and by no means conscious, but had already become established in infinitely fine ramifications, is the direct organizational consequence of the high degree of population density. The process of the division of labour is conditioned by a further, hitherto unrecognized fact, which it has created just as much as it is a prerequisite and condition for its maintenance and continuation. This is the fact of an excess wealth of goods, a more than sufficient stock of goods which always remains constant. Before the war we all had no sufficient idea of the size of this stock of goods, of its functional significance for production. Only the restoration of the state of peace

enlightened us about the consequences of the now blatant shortage of goods. The war used up the existing stock of goods firstly by destroying existing goods, e.g. houses, household inventory, living inventory of the economy, clothing of all kinds, most of which was lost with the fallen soldiers, etc.; then by the fact that the goods lost through destruction and general wear and tear were not replaced. To a considerable extent, production was not geared to the manufacture of goods for normal consumption, but goods were manufactured which were intended to destroy peacetime goods by destroying themselves at the same time, such as weapons and ammunition of all kinds: weapons and ammunition of all kinds. Finally, the economic war tore apart divisions of labour and entire groups of production that were connected by sea ceased. In view of this enormous effect of the war in destroying goods, we should not have been surprised if the terrible shortage of goods from which we suffer today had forced an end to the war much earlier. We would never have dreamed that the supply of goods was so great as to make a four- to five-year war possible. There was no way of statistically recording or even estimating the quantity of goods. They were scattered in the abundantly equipped households, in the retail trade, in the wholesale business, in the lavishly stocked inventory of state-owned enterprises and industry, in the warehouses, and finally in the surplus of our entire way of life. What function did these stocks have in the production process? If trade is included in production, it certainly served to stabilize both transport and pricing. For production itself, however, apart from the effect that the stabilization of trade and prices had on production, stocks had the significance of regulating the process of the division of labour, in that goods were naturally only produced in such places and under such conditions where they were unrivalled in terms of quality and price. In contrast to this international economy organized by stockpiling and the division of labour, today we are forced to produce every possible good, regardless of price and local production conditions. Today's production lacks the profitability of the state and the global economy!

Our deplorable state is that we are entering a world economy without stocks, with production estimated to have been cut back to half of its former efficiency. Apart from the production-reducing lack of supplies, there are other reasons for this reduction in production. First and foremost, the mental and physical exhaustion suffered by the whole of humanity as a result of the war and the revolutions, and in Central Europe particularly as a result of malnutrition. Another important circumstance is the shift in the centres of capital that are important for production. The grouping of the centres of capital was naturally adapted to the old world division of labour; the new grouping is

a consequence of war and is no longer in harmony with the natural conditions, the division of men and raw materials among the states of the earth created by nature and history. Capital has migrated from the old Europe to the new worlds, to the United States of North America and the great South American powers, as well as to Japan, which played little part in the war. In all these countries, raw materials are available in abundance, but there is a lack of working hands, which have remained behind in Europe and are without work as a result of the lack of capital and the impoverishment expressed in the low value of European money, since they cannot buy the raw materials for their work. The very difficult problem of balancing the abundance of raw materials and capital in the new world and the abundance of willingness to work, work opportunities and labour in the impoverished old world will not be discussed further here. All that is important for us is the fact, sufficiently explained by all these reasons, that the war has exhausted the world's supplies and reduced production almost to half, so that at present almost half of mankind cannot be sufficiently fed, clothed and employed, and that we must therefore all get through an age of very difficult international economic relations and great physical privations until, by gradually increasing production, we have restored normal conditions, the abundance of goods, the stock economy and a more perfect division of labour. For the old Europe, therefore, there is only one duty: to place all its policies under the aspect of increasing production, for the good of each individual nation and for the simultaneous good of all nations! The imposition to change the economic and social system at this moment for some idealistic reason or out of desperation or fear, the imposition to Bolshevize us, the danger that we will be Bolshevized, must therefore be warded off and fought against in every possible way. The Bolshevization of densely populated Germany, of densely populated Europe, means making complete the misfortune which the war has initiated and which, given the degree of development of our society and economy, can hardly be cured; it means that at least half of our population must be destroyed, which, however, Bolshevism would do by force. For only then would there be that relative self-sufficiency of life which would permit communist forms of existence.

* * *

However, the danger of Bolshevization is now greater than we want to recognize today. For it is not only the military attack of Bolshevism, the probability of which we have explained above, that threatens us from the consequences of the downright criminal policy of entering into negotiations with the Soviet government, which are now becoming popular. The restoration

of traffic has opened all doors to Bolshevik propaganda from Russia. It is true that the Soviet government declared that it would undertake in the European treaties to refrain from any interference in the internal affairs of the European states and from any propaganda in favour of Bolshevism. How lightly it will take these solemn promises is illustrated by the cynical statements made a few days ago by the Bolshevik city commander of Petersburg, Mr. Zinoviev, to the correspondent of the "New York Herald". Mr. Zinoviev expressly affirms that the Soviet government still adheres to the original goal of its policy, the world revolution. Only the methods of this policy would and could be changed today, inasmuch as the Soviet government no longer needed to engage in revolutionary propaganda itself. The Western revolutions had created enough viable communist parties everywhere so that revolutionary propaganda could be left to the Third International, the Communist International. Moreover, the Central Bureau of the Third International was located in Moscow, which would continue to be the high school for the revolutionary agitators of the whole world. Already today there was a strong influx of communists from all countries into this school in Moscow, who never left, equipped with all the tools of Russian Bolshevism, to express what they had learned in the various national forms.

What power do the Central European governments in particular have to render this work of the Third International harmless? Can the communist agitator be hindered in his work anywhere after the Russian communist state has been recognized? And if one day we are forced by the attack of the Soviet power to call for volunteers to form defensive armies, how can we convince the people that the Bolsheviks are our mortal enemies, since today and in the future, in order to justify the policy of negotiations, we tell them that the Bolsheviks are worthy of negotiation and are not an international danger?

So what should one do? I still advise: under no circumstances should we cancel or interrupt negotiations that have already begun. However, it is pointed out that the English approach has placed us in Central Europe in a predicament where we are forced to follow suit, and that the English approach ultimately proves that England no longer takes Russian Bolshevism seriously, but rather wants to outmanoeuvre it diplomatically, counting on its collapse or transformation. I absolutely deny that we have been put in any kind of predicament by the English approach. To prove this, I must, of course, briefly address the various motives that have been and continue to be decisive for the policies of the various European states towards Russia.

English policy towards Russia was undoubtedly very interesting, if only because it was so opaque. The bourgeois-Russian side claimed with all seriousness and with very convincing evidence that England had been playing a double game with Russia for a long time. England had supported the armies of Yudenich, Denikin and Kolchak with credit and the supply of ammunition, but had also secretly supplied the Bolsheviks with weapons. Accordingly, it would have been in England's interest to allow the chaotic conditions in Russia to continue and at least to prevent a settlement by keeping the opposing parties in a certain balance of power. If we assume that England really had this intention, her present policy of negotiations with Russia is easy enough to explain. Contrary to expectations, the Bolshevik power has shown itself greatly superior to the various White counter-governments and their armies. Kolchak has been destroyed, Yudenich has been swept away from northwestern Russia, and Denikin has lost land and forces, so that he now finds himself in a weak defensive position deep in the south of Russia. The expansion of victorious Bolshevism now directly threatens England's Asian sphere of interest: India, Turkestan, Afghanistan, Persia and Turkey. In all these countries, England does not have sufficient power to oppose the Bolshevik invaders. The critical social and economic situation of the mother country also prohibits the English government from acting as quickly and energetically as it was otherwise accustomed to, so that England's main interest must be to gain time to prepare an effective defence of all her Asian possessions and spheres of interest. For this reason negotiations are now being entered into, which are very likely to be broken off as soon as they are able to repel Russian Bolshevism by force. To conceal the intention, cosmopolitan motives are used, such as that it is in the interests of the economic consolidation of Europe to establish trade relations with Soviet Russia.

In this analysis of English policy only one point remains to be clarified: the first reasons why England is interested in the temporary continuation of uncertain conditions in Russia, the prolongation of the state of struggle between the bourgeoisie and the Bolsheviks. One could see them in the financial and economic situation of England. There is no doubt that England intends to exploit Russia as well as Central Europe as an open door area in the interest of expanding and strengthening her world trade monopoly. However, the English financial and economic forces are still too weak for this activity. Its victory in the World War brought England the fulfillment of a long-cherished world political hope, the *mare clausum* ¹⁾ of the Indian Ocean. The British flag flies all around the coasts of the Indian Ocean, the line Cape Town-Cairo-Aden Baghdad-Tehran to Bombay is entirely English. The long-

disputed territories of Mesopotamia and Persia have fallen into the lap of the English world power. Anyone who has understood the political sense of the English colonial economy knows that political security is achieved by seizing the country's primitive forces. In Mesopotamia as well as in Persia, England was granted all the first and second concessions for the possession and exploitation of the raw materials of these countries. England has the first hand on the oil fields of Mesopotamia-Persia, the fruit plains of Mesopotamia, the cotton land of Bukhara, the ores and coal of Persia. The construction of railroads and all transportation facilities intended to make these treasures accessible had to be conceded to him. However, England's finances and economy, overstretched by the war, lacked the necessary resources to realize these possessions. England was forced to seek American loans for the most urgent oriental economic tasks. At the same time, however, to tap into the Russian masses would mean overstretching its credit. Thus, England has an interest in "reclaiming" Russia for itself.

1) "Mare clausum" - the sea that is under the jurisdiction of a particular country.

To what extent we should be forced to join the current English negotiations is incomprehensible under these circumstances and otherwise. On the contrary, England would probably have an interest in our passive or even hostile behaviour. . But if the English negotiations, contrary to the view presented here, are serious, then they can indeed only have the foolish intention to which they publicly profess, namely, to obtain goods from Russia by resuming trade there. In that case we must say to ourselves that the English intention will not achieve its object, and that we have an interest in letting England alone have bad experiences. The idea that we are too late is downright absurd. Even in a bourgeois Russia, neither the English nor the Americans are in a position to work there without us. Should they dare this experiment, we can be sure that they will lose a great deal of money and will eventually be forced to take us with them. This monopoly of our position in Russia is sufficiently justified and secured by our geographical position, by the natural relationship of mutual production and by our experience in Russian economic life, and finally also by our relative abundance of human resources.

Incidentally, England is by no means supported by America in its Russian policy today. Japan is even completely opposed to it. England has only the support of her continental European satellites, including, reluctantly enough, that of France. The French attitude towards Russia was and is driven by the

fear that Germany will one day recover economically at the hands of Russia and thereby regain political power. All French policy lives or dies by the fear of German revenge for the violent peace of Versailles. Therefore, France has pursued a border state policy with all its might—bourgeois border state policy, of course—in the hope of being able to play these bourgeois border states off against Germany and, at the same time, prevent the emergence of a new Great Russian power that could side with Germany. Its border state policy, which, incidentally, is very different from the English base policy pursued with the help of the coastal states, is only being abandoned by France with a heavy heart in order to be able to follow the temporary English directive. Thus France, too, has no interest in our coming to an understanding with Soviet Russia. All other European states are incapable of pursuing a policy toward Russia; all other peoples have the hunger and hope of satisfying this hunger through Russia. Well, this hope must be put aside. Besides, they all know only one enemy - Russian Bolshevism!

Again and again, we must be reminded to take this enemy seriously, that the idea that Russian Bolshevism is capable of development or change, as is being blamed on an English policy that is truly not far-sighted, is a vain and childish game. They compare the Russian Bolshevik Revolution with the French Revolution of 1789 and hope for a Napoleon who will bring sense and order to it. But the French and Russian revolutions have nothing in common. The French Revolution of 1789 was born out of the oppressed spirit of European culture, which emancipated and completed itself through this very revolution. It was the individualism of our Christian-Germanic-Roman culture that triumphed with the third estate, the estate of citizens, intellectuals and entrepreneurs. The Russian revolution, however, comes from Asia, it is "xenophobic", directed against the individualistic, capitalist culture brought to Russia by the West, it conjures up ancient Asian religious ideas, that quietist, anti-labour fraternity which is the essence of Chinese wisdom. The Bolshevik revolution wants to destroy Europe, first everything that is European in Russia, and then the whole of old Europe, which again cannot be without Russia, without its youth and future. The horoscope of world history must be set so that the question is whether Russia is to be saved for Europe and thereby save Europe, or whether Russia is to be absorbed into Asia and thus Europe is to be Asiatized. But then it is our task to work on the destruction of Asiatic Bolshevism, not - deceiving ourselves - to believe in the "metamorphosis" of Bolshevism and cowardly wait for Napoleon, the Messiah of the Revolution, until it is too late! Incidentally, if one wants to understand the Russian Revolution in a general and comparative historical perspective, one can only

go back to Russian history. That great revolution, which began with the death of Ivan the Terrible and only ended with the accession of the Romanovs, offers a shocking parallel to the chaos of our day. Then, too, counter-governments and foreign powers fought for a revolutionary Moscow with ever-changing successes; then, too, a Bolshevik prophet came from the Asian south of Russia with an army to whom he preached the plundering of the boyars' wealth under communist ideas. The end was general exhaustion, which allowed an easy victory for the weak but ambitious Romanovs.

The outcome of Bolshevik glory is uncertain. It may last longer than it has vitality, because Europe is not in a position to muster itself for the powerful blows that would shatter the Soviet power today; because Europe is too disunited or too exhausted for this, on the whole, as each of its peoples is alone. For who would dare to call upon Germany today to join in a war against the Soviet power without an attack by the latter? The attempt would be unsuccessful. All we can do is not to negotiate!

But now there are negotiations after all! This increases the danger enormously, but at the same time, the historic opportunity to fulfill Germany's European mission vis-à-vis Russia is growing. For as soon as Soviet Russia attacks us after it has crushed Poland, we will be forced to deploy an army against its power. Now a Bolshevik enemy can never be fought purely on the defensive; in the trenches the soldier all too easily succumbs to the opposing Bolshevik agitation. Only an offensive defence against Bolshevism can be successful. Strike the enemy where he is found, pursue him and strike him again - that will be the watchword if a Red army threatens our borders and we should march once more.

The big question is only whether we will have an army at the hour of danger. I repeat that the unhindered Bolshevik propaganda, which has already begun with the negotiations of our incompetent Reich leadership and foreign policy, which flirts with Bolshevism, will undermine the power of resistance, the will of our people to defend themselves. Against this, with the government or against it, a massive propaganda campaign must be launched, educating all parties and leaders and the broad masses of the people. If the government has a conscience, it can at least not close its mind to the danger that its negotiations with the Bolsheviks are creating. And so, if it believes it cannot avoid the negotiations, it is obliged to at least prepare the safeguards that can cope with the danger, i.e. to think today about military border protection and the formation of an army. According to expert opinion, the mobilization of a

volunteer army of half a million will take at least eight weeks. The peace treaty does not permit it; Therefore, relations with the powers of the Treaty of Versailles must be established on this point now. The task should not be too difficult. The conflicting interests of both the major agents of world politics and the individual European powers open up broad possibilities for a reasonably skilled diplomacy. However, not only must permission to raise an army be obtained; consent and cooperation in the entire coming campaign against Soviet Russia must be achieved. Today's Germany is hardly in a position to supply a modern field army of half a million to a million men with everything it needs. Loans and army material (including clothing and boots for the troops) can only be procured with the help of foreign countries.

We are not actually thinking of an international action against Soviet Russia. If we allow all circumstances to play out calmly, it will be an army consisting essentially of German troops that will be responsible for the destruction of the Soviet power and the liberation of Moscow. But it would not be advisable to allow this army to operate as a German force. The army must ally itself from the outset with a democratic Russian power; it must be an auxiliary force of a Russian government, a government organized along Russian lines and supported by the broad masses of the Russian peasant population. Even if the supreme command should de facto be in German hands, this must not be expressed for the sake of ensuring political success. German vanity must not be allowed to play tricks on us. Moreover, we have unfortunately proved in this war that we are not particularly suitable as "liberators". The mistakes of 1914/15 must not be repeated, nor must the mistakes of the actions of Kolchak, Yudenich and Denikin, who more or less lacked the power of government: the confidence of the population, organization and the necessary technical and military resources.

The summer of 1920 will bring the crisis of European history. The relationship between Russia and Europe will determine whether we will enter a new future, which will only flourish with a democratic Russia, or die the Asian death. If Europe saves Russia, then the great game of world-historical agents will be revived, in which, as shown at the beginning, we too will have a role to play if we know how to wrestle ourselves up from being the object of politics, from being a will-less "area of the open door", to being the subject, the will of world politics.

* * *

A forgotten Baltic poet:

Alexander von Sternberg

by Dr. Joachim Kühn

Famous Baltic poets, Baltic poets who have become known beyond the borders of their immediate homeland and who have played a role in German literary life, can be counted on the fingers of one's hand. It is all the more remarkable that one of the most talented Baltic writers of the nineteenth century, who shares with Pantenius and Keyserling the fame of having most successfully represented the Baltic provinces in German literature, Alexander von Sternberg, has virtually disappeared over the years. The hundredth anniversary of his birth, the fiftieth anniversary of his death, has passed even in the Baltic States without even a small newspaper remembering him, a complete edition of his writings has never been attempted, his original editions are bibliographical rarities, his personality has been erased, and yet he has left behind a literary legacy of thirty or forty volumes, which were devoured in their time and which are by no means so faded today that they deserve the oblivion that has descended upon them with cruel indiscrimination.

Admittedly, Sternberg did not meet this fate entirely through no fault of his own. He never cared about so-called popularity, he was an aristocrat and reactionary from head to toe, and when he wrote, he had a very exclusive readership in mind - the great world of the Biedermeier era. To overcome their boredom, their world-weariness, their blasé attitude was his highest goal; to cheat a dandy of Prince Pückler's stature out of a walk with a novella, to deprive a great lady of her night's rest with a fantastic fairy tale or to be the center of conversation in some feudal society – these were the sweetest rewards for his work, and therefore he never found the popular response that alone can perpetuate the fleeting fame of the hour. He squandered his rich gifts in order to become indispensable to the most capricious and disliked circles of the nation; in order to retain their favour, he always preferred what was immediately gripping to the lastingly valuable, and that is why his fame evaporated when the pre-March salons closed their doors to make way for the age of machines and village stories.

But that is not enough to justify Sternberg's permanent oblivion. On the contrary. Precisely because he wrote exclusively for the reactionary world of

the Biedermeier period, precisely because he developed his novels, novellas and fairy tales from within their sphere of vision and trimmed them to suit their taste with well-read eclecticism, tailored them to their tastes, precisely for that reason they have, over time, become cultural-historical documents that reflect the social life and aesthetic horizons of this vanished world in charming images and examples. The ultimate truth, however, that transforms the social novel into a historical novel once the present in which it is set has become the past, the absolute honesty and faithfulness to colour that is characteristic of the contemporary realism of the French and English - all of this is lacking in Sternberg. He allowed himself to be influenced by Tieck and George Sand, by Gresset and Cr billon, without maintaining his own style, and this denied him a decisive role from the outset. The reason for this, however, lies less in himself than in the circumstances that constrained and impaired his best years. He himself only said what he wanted to say; he preferred to portray himself as a feudal idler who, thank God, had no need to take part in the literary hustle and bustle of the day; he presented his writings as ideas that for the most part lacked inner coherence or inner necessity; he thereby abetted contemporary criticism, which emphasized his "Protean" ¹⁾ productivity without distinguishing between desired and compelled writings or grasping the gradation of the latter. He conspired against himself throughout his life because it seemed bourgeois to take his literary work seriously, and because, on the other hand, he was too proud and too vain to admit the pecuniary inhibitions that counteracted a purer development and purpose of his will. He concealed the fact that in his best years he bore the bitter fate of the penniless man of letters, forced to work his talent to death in gruelling daily work because otherwise he could not afford his hotel room, his padded overcoat and his patent leather shoes, about the fact that for decades he had striven to unite the demands of the book market and the wishes of the salons with his own ambitious goals until it was too late. And yet it is precisely this double predicament that is the real reason why, despite his considerable talent, despite his position in the literary life of his time, he ultimately only became "a certain Sternberg", "of whom", as Heinrich Laube assures us in his memoirs, "no one knows any more".

1) "Protean" - tending or able to change frequently or easily - originating from the name of the Greek sea god Proteus, known for his ability to change shape at will.

The following pages will first attempt to lift the quarantine over his life's work and replace it with a certain interest in his personality and his creativity.

We have refrained from writing a biography in the true sense of the word, a description of the circle in which he moved, as he himself gave a description of his milieu and his time in his "Erinnerungsblätter" (collected works), which have recently been updated in a comprehensive edition*), which cannot be overtaken. Rather, the present study sets itself the task of supplementing the "Erinnerungsblätter" from a critical point of view. Whereas there the writer's life and work were merely used to string together a colourful abundance of enchanting social images, here they are to take centre stage and be summarized in as sharply defined a sketch as possible. On the one hand, the long series of his works, his essays and prefaces serve as a basis, and on the other hand, alongside the notes and reviews of contemporaries scattered here and there, the informative letters he wrote to Ludmilla Assing and above all to Apollonius von Maltitz. They are in Varnhagen von Ense's estate at the Berlin State Library and are being used for the first time in this work.

*) Alexander von Sternberg, „Erinnerungsblätter aus der Biedermeierzeit“ (Memorabilia from the Biedermeier period), edited and introduced by Joachim Kühn, Potsdam-Berlin, Gustav Kiepenheuer, 1919.

Alexander von Sternberg's civil name was Alexander Freiherr von Ungern-Sternberg, thus coming from an old Baltic family that has played a prominent role in the history of the Baltic provinces since the thirteenth century and is closely connected and related through marriage to the other great houses of the country, the Tiesenhausens, Uexkülls, Rosens, Vietinghoffs. Stackelbergs. His father, Baron Friedrich von Ungern-Sternberg, was one of the most respected representatives of the Estonian knighthood as District Administrator of the Province of Estonia, Lord of Noistfer and Master of the Chair of the Isis Lodge in Reval; his mother also came from long-established nobility, she was born Countess von Manteuffel. Alexander von Sternberg was the ninth child of this couple and was born on April 22, 1806 in Noistfer near Reval. It was a grey, age-old feudal estate, with its gardens and farm buildings nestled in miles of cornfields; the charm of patriarchal lordship surrounded it, and the boy also encountered patriarchal lordship in Reval, where his father headed the provincial administration in the name of the Tsar. This led him early on to abandon the idea of belonging to a ruling class, and this thought gradually turned him into what he displayed with unwise naturalness in the best years of his life - a Junker, an "aristocrat of the coat of arms". "Born and educated in a country where there are only nobles and peasants, where the sprouts of the lower classes derive their growth and

strength only from the soil of the nobility," he himself later confessed, "was it any wonder that I did not become an aristocrat, but only a Junker? The three provinces that Russia took from Sweden are united in preserving the prerogatives of their nobility to the last drop of blood. This one strong thought holds them fast and forms their national honour. A Livonian nobleman is a nobleman per excellence, as is a Curonian, an Estonian. Seventy years ago, this Junkerism was so grotesquely developed, so colossally grimacing in its forms, that the German Junker could be called a striving beginner in comparison, at most the Pomeranian was on a par with him. Read Kotzebue's delightful descriptions, which came very close to the truth. In such a country, the aristocracy of the coat of arms is the only conceivable aristocracy"

And there was another thing that became second nature to Sternberg in his early youth: a penchant for the romantic and the supernatural, which found the richest nourishment in the winding alleyways of Reval and the spooky ruins and castles of the hinterland. The gloomy legends of the Estonian population, handed down by the servants, the holdings of his father's library in Noistfer, which contained complete editions of Hoffmann and Fouqué, Brentano and Arnim, but above all Kotzebue and Tieck, did the rest to increase and deepen the boy's fantastic taste. Finally, he also had a certain atavistic ¹⁾ disposition towards such a school of thought from the outset. It has already been mentioned that Sternberg's father was a Freemason; it should be added that his grandfather and great-grandfather had been Pietists; a sister of the great-grandfather had died in Herrnhut, a sister of the grandfather also moved there; a brother of the father lived as a kind of missionary in southern Russia. The mystical elements, which appear here and there in Sternberg's stories, can undoubtedly be traced back to these family-historical inspirations and memories.

1) Atavistic - relating to or characterized by reversion to something ancient or ancestral.

At the age of fourteen, Sternberg moved from his father's house to Dorpat, where an uncle had been active in high legal offices for many years. He attended grammar school there from 1821 to 1826. At this time, his father died and Sternberg came under the special care of his uncle and a brother-in-law, who was employed at the university as secretary of the pension chamber. Of course, nothing changed in Sternberg's immediate future as a result of this turn of events. His father had wanted him to become a diplomat; his uncle also

wanted to see him in the Tsar's civil service; both programs required legal studies, and so Sternberg attended lectures on political science and economics. However, his participation in these courses was limited to attendance; otherwise they were indifferent or repugnant to him; instead, he listened to lectures on history, aesthetics and logic "for the sake of curiosity", as he later confessed, "but I soon left", - on political science - "which I also soon skipped", - and finally on philosophy, which was apparently presented in the Schellingian sense. All of this was more suited to his "peculiar direction" than dry pandects and collections of ukases (bound sets of laws and decrees of the land), which he would actually have had to work through. Sternberg had already discovered at grammar school that he had an artistic streak; At the age of fourteen he had written no less than six tragedies in addition to numerous poems, and had also produced several notebooks with appealing pencil studies and watercolours, And even though he kept them quietly locked in his desk and never for a moment considered emerging later as a poet or painter, they were nevertheless symptomatic of an inner development that would inevitably lead to quite different results than an Imperial Russian State Councillor or Ambassador. His uncle foresaw this and so did his brother-in-law; they therefore tried to keep their protégé's awakening desire for expression within moderate limits. But of course they could not keep a constant rein on the growing young man, and so they had to experience that one day he appeared before the broader public as a literary figure. In 1828, Schleicher's "Esthona", a literary journal published in his home town of Reval, published a historical story from his pen, "The Russian Camp off Narva", followed in 1829 by two more novellas, "The Underground Passage" and "The Stagecoach"; At the same time, poems, romances and ballads appeared in Neu's ¹⁾ "Inländischer Dichtergarten" (Native Poet's Garden), all of which proved that the youngest offspring of the deceased district administrator was inclined towards a passion that was entirely inappropriate to his station, which the state and society regarded as a questionable and compromising display and, in any case, did not support.

1) Alexander Heinrich Neus (1795 - 1876,) was an Estonian Baltic German Estophile folklorist, pedagogue and poet.

After all, Sternberg himself was still far too deeply entrenched in the prejudices of his caste to really think about a literary or artistic career. When he wrote, he did so as a distinguished dilettante; when he drew, it was for entertainment, to satisfy an awakening vanity. Thus, after completing his

indifferently served triennium, he allowed himself to be sent to St. Petersburg without resistance, where he was now to be practically inducted into the legal civil service. But fate had decided otherwise; it led him to the house of the State Councillor Joukoffsky, who was in close contact with his uncle from Dorpat, and Joukoffsky's position in the literary world, his poems and translations, his polished personality did not leave Sternberg untouched. Gradually, he found himself trying to reconcile his uncle's wishes with his talent, working towards a position in some scholarly or purely literary field in the civil service, and Joukoffsky, who held an influential position at court as the author of the Russian Tsar's Anthem and as the tutor of the later Tsar Alexander II, was supposed to help him. However, before a discussion with Joukoffsky could take place, the latter discovered the painting skills of his young guest on his own initiative, asked to see his sketchbooks and presented them to the reigning Empress Alexandra Feodorovna, who was then moved to grant the young Baltic baron a travel grant from her private coffers to complete his artistic training.

To become a painter! Sternberg had thought much less of this possibility than of writing.*) But the scholarship was there; it had become clear to him over time that he would not feel comfortable in the usual career of the Russian Chinovnik; moreover, this gave him the opportunity to see Germany, which magnetically attracted him as the home of his favourite poet Tieck; and since, as a scholarship holder of the Empress, he forgave nothing to his feudal dignity, he accepted her grace. His relatives in Dorpat, his mother in Reval and his sister in Noistfer thought similarly. In this way, Sascha could become a court painter, gallery director, chamberlain, he could make himself indispensable to the Empress and the Grand Duchesses, could paint their portraits, could design their costumes and masquerade suits: when he used the outbreak of the terrible cholera epidemic of 1831 as an excuse to speed up the final formalities, he was allowed to leave for a foreign country without worry. Although his fate would be somewhat more unusual than that of the family members up to that point, he remained an Ungern-Sternberg, and that was ultimately the main thing.

*) According to Falck's account published in the "Baltische Monatsschrift" volume 70, whose sources are not given, Sternberg had already thought of becoming a painter in Dorpat, and his uncle had favored this plan, as he would still have preferred to see his nephew as a painter rather than a writer. Joukoffsky, who would have been in Dorpat at the time, would have been of the same opinion and would

have called Sternberg to Petersburg in 1830 after he had become tutor to the imperial children. The above account is based on Sternberg's own statements in the pocket book "Penelope" (1846, p. X).

How Sternberg ended up in Lübeck, how he came to Dresden and there, following a swarm of literature-loving compatriots who made the traditional tour of the Dresden salons, also found his way into Tieck's circle, how he then continued his escape from cholera in the company of the painter-archaeologist Otto von Stackelberg, how he travelled via Nuremberg to Mannheim, where he took up residence for the following winter and - probably on the recommendation of a Dresden-based cousin of the Baden privy councillor and court theatre director Wilhelm von Ungern-Sternberg - found the most gracious reception in the salon of the widowed Grand Duchess Stephanie von Baden. What he does not mention is the spiritual clarification that took place in him at that time, the fixing of his inner man, who began to feel more and more clearly - even if not yet fully expressed - as a writer. It seems almost certain that the princely position Tieck occupied in Dresden society played a part in this fixation, even if Sternberg's notes contain no mention of it. In any case, a coffee house with writers busily taking notes, a poor editorial office or an unheated study would not exactly have encouraged him to embark on a literary career. The fact that he got to know it from its most brilliant side, that he found the idolized master in splendid circumstances, certainly had a considerable influence on his subsequent decisions.

Sternberg spent the rest of 1831 in Mannheim and, with the exception of a few months which he used for a trip to Geneva, most of the following year as well; months full of restless receptivity, which fertilized his field of vision with lasting impressions of a personal and political nature. The liberal, unpretentious nature of southern and western German society, which confronted him in sharp contrast to the conditions in St. Petersburg and Dorpat in the Mannheim salons, the leading position that the liberal merchant, the young German journalist occupied in these circles, the decaying majesty of the Rhine, the ruins of the Rococo castles in Baden, which he got to know on extended excursions in the surrounding area, the political turbulence of the times, which hit him with particular force in this in this weather-torn corner of the German Confederation - all of this gripped and tugged at his nerves, strove for a statement, for expression and release. This is how the novel "Die Zerrissenen" (The Torn Ones) came into being, a fantastic sequence of scenes that jumbles up a prince, his lover, his bride, his fool, a few painters, free spirits and eccentrics, without leading to a clear plot. What it wants to portray

is the tension between the aristocratic way of life of the great world of the time - the way of life of the eighteenth century, which was still perceived as authoritative and enchanting, and the democratic demands of the newly dawning bourgeois, of the current age. The members of the great world who are torn between these two irreconcilable opposites, who can no longer pay homage to one age and do not yet want to pay homage to the other, are the "torn", to whom this catchphrase has stuck as a permanent designation - albeit in an ironic secondary sense.

Sternberg later said of his first major story that it reflected the agitated time of its creation, its affectation, its real and imagined sympathies, that it was an unfinished and student-like improvisation that he regretted having written; the book had not been well received in his Mannheim circle; only the Heidelberg students had read it. That is certainly too harsh a judgment. In fact, the "Zerrissenen" caused a huge stir in their day and made a name for their young author in one fell swoop. When they appeared in fragments in May, June and July 1832 in the Stuttgart "Morgenblatt", the leading family journal of the Cottaschen publishing house, with which Sternberg had been in contact since the fall of 1831, they were reviewed and recommended by contemporary critics even before they were published in book form, as if they were a new masterpiece of German literature. Even the North German press joined in the general joy of discovery, and the otherwise skeptical Gubitzsche "Gesellschafter" (Companion) published a page-long review in its critical supplement of June 25, enthusiastically emphasizing that it was pleasing and comforting to see men like A. Sternberg appearing in the literary hustle and bustle of the present, who understood their time from an artistic point of view and reproduced it in artistic (contemporary and new) form. The language is bold and descriptive; thoughts, images, and comparisons are lavished every moment, but never uselessly, but always revealing the virtuosity of the author, "who has all and any means at his disposal; and as for the characters portrayed, they are indeed torn, "but torn in all the characteristics of the time. They are witty and humorously fragmented, their witticisms painfully entertaining; they are addicted to pleasure, but they enjoy the distasteful, for they have enjoyed too much of the tree of knowledge to be capable of pure enjoyment. They are weary of life, playing a frivolous game with sin and crime, for they would be too weak to take it seriously; they are wise and mad at the same time, as Hamlet might be if he were not a prince of Denmark but a German private citizen, as Jacques and other melancholy fools of Shakespeare might now show themselves. Although the author was not permitted to depict power, grandeur, or sublimity, but rather intended to convey impressions quite

the opposite, his portrayals are read with pleasure and edification, both in an artistic sense, of course. The reviewer cannot suppress only one concern, and that is that the fragments presented in the "Morgenblatt" will never coalesce into a novella. This is all the more regrettable as the greatest prose works of modern German literature - Goethe's "Wilhelm Meister", Schiller's "Geisterseher" (The Ghost-Seer) and Tieck's "Sternbald" - also remained fragments.

The flattering form of this reception prompted Sternberg to put his obligations to the Empress on the back burner and instead forge new literary projects. In itself a risk, but with some self-knowledge he had to admit that his success was due not only to writing ability, but also to the political situation and above all to Tieck, whose merits and weaknesses were displayed in the "Zerrissenen", apart from the lack of clarity in the overall composition, the neglect of the plot and the insertion of long polemical discussions; reasonably so, incidentally, since an isolated attempt was in any case not enough to develop the limits of his talent. In addition, there were the concessions that Cotta and Schwab, the celebrated editors of the "Morgenblatt", showed him; there was also an undeniable dose of personal vanity, which had always been characteristic of him; and so he moved to Stuttgart in the winter of 1832 to 1833, where he initially took up residence temporarily and then permanently from the fall of 1833. His main contact at that time was Schwab, who supported him in word and deed by having the young guest read his newly written novellas to the family and pointing out any weaknesses; when Sternberg was absent from Stuttgart, Schwab dealt with Cotta and took care of the proof sheets intended for him. *)

*) Klüpfel reports in his biography of Schwab (Leipzig 1858) that Sternberg came to Stuttgart at the beginning of 1832, recommended to Schwab by a friend from Nuremberg; in this case he must have come from Mannheim and returned there after completing his business. - In any case, he spent the summer of 1833 in Baden-Baden, where he also spent the following summer (cf. the preface to the novel "Wilhelm", Berlin 1849). From Stuttgart, he undertook short trips to Vienna and northern Italy: "I did not want to see Rome, I was not allowed to see Paris; it was a forbidden place for all Russians at the time" ("Penelope" 1846, p. XII).

In this way, in addition to numerous shorter stories and fairy tales, three further large novellas were written in the following three years, which more or less justifiably claimed to be sequels to "The Torn": 1833's "Eduard", which directly followed on from the events of the first novella without reaching its

inner content; in the summer of 1834, "Lessing", a literary novella whose exuberant hero has only the name in common with the staid author of "Miss Sara Sampson"; and in the fall of 1834, "Molière", a tale from the time of Louis XIV., in which an average love story with the performance of "Tartüffe" ("The Impostor" or "The Hypocrite", a play by Molière) and the last years of its creator's life were spun together rather arbitrarily. The artistic value of these books in no way approached that of "The Torn", and even if the critics were still extraordinarily indulgent - Wolfgang Menzel, for example, judged "Lessing" to be "indisputably one of the best productions in this field" - there was no hiding the fact that they basically expected more from Sternberg than fodder for the lending library. All the more undivided was the applause of the reactionary salons, to whom Sternberg had appeared as their house poet since the "Zerrissenen", because his conscious rejection of the democratic tendencies of the young German zeitgeist, his elegant style, his cultivated art of entertainment suited the prevailing tone of the world at large; A dangerous favour which, over time, was bound to lead to colourless slickness, showmanship and aestheticizing frivolity if it did not succeed in connecting with the living forces of the nation. Sternberg gradually saw through this. On the other hand, it gradually dawned on him that his previous writings had arisen not so much from a creative urge as from an instinct for imitation; he had to admit that Theodor Mundt was not wrong he dismissed him as a "witty animal child" in a review of the "Literary Zodiacus" around that time; and even if he could claim of his own accord that he did indeed have a deep inner affinity with the Dresden old master - both were North Germans, after all, who always feel more with their heads than with their hearts, no matter how romantically they behave - the realization of their influence was enough to bring about a reaction in him over time. Gradually, he made the decision to pull up stakes and return to Estonia. What seems to have brought this decision to maturity was the fact that around that time his family's financial situation deteriorated significantly; the grants became scarce, the Empress's scholarship ceased; debts had to be incurred, and these debts became more and more threatening, as Sternberg had never learned to be frugal. So it was best to break away before the real hardship began. He had dreamed a beautiful dream; he had made a name for himself that was bound to make him a sight to behold at home; now it was time to "rank up". When you have reached the age of thirty and have an old name that outweighs all literary laurels from the outset, you are content with this kind of glory.

The news that his mother was seriously ill hastened his departure; he left Stuttgart in mid-1836. In Swinemünde, however, he learned that his mother

had already died, which initially prompted him to stay in the small harbor town for a few months. What to do now? Return home despite this blow? Travel to St. Petersburg to apply for a state position there? He came to no decision. Meanwhile, his inner thoughts began to ferment and work anew. For some time he had been planning to write a novel that would revive the sunken splendour of the Rococo period; from Baden-Baden and Mannheim he had repeatedly visited Schwetzingen, whose overgrown park with its corroded and mossy marble pictures, sunken ponds, ancient bathing temples and mosques had captured his torn heart with melancholy force. Frequent excursions had also taken him to (Schloss) Favorite, the delightful pleasure palace near Rastatt, where the margraves of Baden had resided. Here the century had been young, which he regarded with increasing homesickness as his century; here had lived that which he missed ever more bitterly in the prosaic tangle of his own time: a uniformly educated, aristocratic lifestyle that placed beauty and esprit above all else; a lifestyle without the morality-soaked philistinism of the present, which had only gained in unnaturalness, not morality. To conjure up anew the psychological and scenic elements of this sunken world seemed to him a seductive task; it might seem frivolous if it only gave expression to the poet's longing, if it only relieved him of the figures and thoughts he had been carrying around with him for years

It was in this mood that Sternberg left Swinemünde: first to Berlin, because he hoped to live the loneliest life in the big city; from there to Weimar, which was predestined to be the seat of the Muses. It was there that he wrote the book that Sternberg has repeatedly described as the real starting point of his writing career - the novel "Galathee". "From then on, I entered into a peculiarly literary figure," he later recounted. "Every author should be honest about this, because everyone can, and openly, admit which book he has written, finally free of the crutches and supports handed down to him by school and authority. There is a very legitimate pride in stating the point in time when one finally became master in one's own house. The commissioner who serves in Goethe's great house of commerce may do more brilliant business, but he does not work with the joy and pride with which the subordinate small tradesman works, who has his own firm posted above his door.

"Galathee" is essentially an epistolary ¹⁾ novella; rapturous heartfelt outpourings alternate with novellistically rounded self-confessions, and from time to time the narrator himself takes the floor to hint at the progress of events in a few sentences. The style of the narrative is always highly coherent,

and in the description of a moonlit night in spring, a morning mood in midsummer, it rises to a high level of beauty. The subjectivity of the form corresponds to the plot. Robert von St. Cyr, a cavalier who, after many adventures in war and love, pays a visit to the Favorite in the retinue of a German prince, meets the young Countess Galathee, a blooming, soulful creature who fills his tired, disappointed heart with new longing. His longing soon grows into passion, he courts her affections and continues his efforts even when he learns that she is already promised to another. And Galathee's inexperienced heart does not find the strength to reject his courtship: one thundery afternoon she becomes his, and when the fiancé returns home from abroad, where he has sought a post, he finds his place occupied. A duel is the result of this discovery; it costs him his life, but also separates the two lovers, who guiltily take leave of each other, not to reunite until they have overcome the shattering impression of this catastrophe. Robert goes to the south of France, but it does not hold him; he has to return to Favorite, and there his fortunes take a turn for the worse. Just as Galathee inflamed him at the time, so now a young, pretty, lively woman, the Countess Melicerte, sets him on fire; although she does not come close to Galathee, she is able to gradually displace the image of his beloved, and while she regains her peace in the distance, Melicerte draws him deeper and deeper into her web. At last he decides to break off his engagement; Melicerte obtains a divorce and is prepared to give him her hand in marriage, but makes the condition - and here lies the real reason for her coquetry - that he converts to Catholicism. Melicerte is nothing other than a tool of Father Jerome, a sinister Jesuit who dominates the margravine residing in Favorite with dark flagellant arts, and if she casts her spell over Robert, she is supposed to win a new soul for the Ecclesia militans. - During the engagement ceremony, a nearby castle, to which Galathee had withdrawn, goes up in flames, the illness from which she had been wasting away since her separation from Robert takes a decisive turn, she dies, and Robert, rushing to her, collapses at her bedside. A joyless marriage with Melicerte follows, then he goes to a monastery, broken, to seek the peace that love has denied him in strict self-mortification.

1) An epistolary novel is typically written as a series of documents, most commonly letters, but also including diary entries, newspaper clippings, or other forms of written communication.

Sternberg certainly gave this story much, very much of his own: the hero's religious tendencies, his inclination towards the mystical colourfulness of

Catholicism, his desire to end his youth, his longing to "no longer feed on goods that he had only stolen, not acquired" - all of this corresponded to the desperate mood that Sternberg had been carrying around with him since Stuttgart. However, the claim to have become the master of his own house with this book and to have his own company posted above the door remained unfounded. And that was, after all, a matter of course. A literary career cannot be started as often as one would like; if a writer has been labelled a "Tieckian" and a "salon poet", he must provide very cogent evidence to the contrary in order to enforce a revision of this judgment, and Sternberg was not in a position to do so. He was, after all, a pupil of Tieck's who could no longer get out of his own skin; he spoke like the eponymous Sternbald (from Tieck's book), whether he wanted to or not; he was not in a position to found his own school; and if he did in fact break away from his master's world of thought and manner of representation, it was at most with the success that he approached other models, which he then followed in a thoroughly independent manner, but followed nonetheless. The two volumes he published from Weimar after the publication of "Galathee", the novel "Psyche" and the satire "Palmyra oder das Tagebuch eines Papageis" ("Palmyra, or the Diary of a Parrot."), are proof of this.

"Psyche", along with "The Torn" and "Galathee", actually established Sternberg's reputation as a favourite writer of the elegant world, although he hushed it up in the "Memoirs"; it was originally intended to stand alongside "Galathee", but under the influence of George Sand ²⁾, whose first novels began to be devoured in Germany at the time, it became a novel of seduction and adultery of genuine French sensibility. The fable is briefly as follows: During a vacation spent at the country estate of his foster father, a retired German general, a young Hungarian aristocrat develops a deep affection for his foster sister, a mimosa-like ¹⁾ young woman who has been in a relationship with an Austrian cavalry captain for several years. He tries to suppress this inclination, but his blood is stronger, and when he realizes at the knight's final arrival that the lonely young woman returns his passion without realizing it herself, he hides in her room one evening and embraces her ardently. This tears asunder the veil that had hitherto veiled their relationship: the young woman realizes, like Apuleius' psyche, that she is not resting in her husband's arms but at Cupid's side, and her unsuspecting purity collapses. Her marriage collapses; divorce is the result; since she is Catholic, she will never be able to reach out her hand to her beloved, but she will inspire him to noble deeds and show him the way to glory out of the night of this youthful aberration. So much for the material. In terms of style (in the higher sense), "Psyche" is one

of the best things Sternberg has ever written. The depiction of the milieu is outstanding; never has life on a German noble estate in the Biedermeier period been described with more elegant strokes than in this book; Never have the typical characters of the time - the emancipated lady of the world who wishes to live her own life gracefully with Rahel ³⁾ and George Sand, the mature officer who has been tossed about far too much in the warlike years of his youth to be able to find his way in life now, the effeminate diplomat, whose interests go no further than oyster pies and embroidery, the old excellency who is still completely rooted in the times of the ancien régime and in his self-importance and gallantry represents a world that has already disappeared - never have these types been portrayed more vividly and more vividly than in this novel. The leading critics of the time gave "Psyche" a glowing review, and even if they rightly criticized Sternberg for letting his heroes - ladies and gentlemen alike - ride a bit too much, they nevertheless showered him with praise on the occasion of this novel. "It is well known that Mr. v. Sternberg is incapable of writing anything witless," Gutzkow ⁴⁾ himself said at the time; "Of all the more recent novelists, Mr. v. Sternberg is closest to Tieck and even surpasses him when it comes to unfolding a rich life experience. Mr. v. Sternberg is far more at home in history and in higher society than Tieck, who only knows the lower and middle classes and, of the salons, only those where art and literature are discussed. Mr. von Sternberg also knows those salons where one can talk about the advancement of an officer in the guard, about a marriage, or about the latest fashion in copper with the same enthusiasm that overcomes Tieck when his characters talk about Camoens, Shakespeare, and Pergolese. . . His style is formed according to the best models and knows how to replace the fine precision that distinguished him earlier (in "The Torn Ones", in "Lessing", etc.) with greater abandon, fluency and a somewhat exaggerated agility. There was only one thing that Gutzkow really found fault with: the Tieckian coldness, which came to light for the first time in this book. "The warm, noble, human feeling never flares out of his people and situations with an even slightly visible flame; so that one must perhaps call him, next to Tieck, the most frivolous German writer now living. The fact that his frivolity is kept to decency lies entirely in the character of that epoch of the last century with which Mr. v. Sternberg fell in love. - Even the insulting element, which, in my opinion, lies in the absolutely always refined sphere of Sternberg's novella, is probably not something everyone can empathize with.

1) Here mimosa is the Spanish word for feminine, not the plant mimosa.

2) George Sand - the pen-name of the prolific female French author Amantine Lucile Aurore Dupin de Francueil (1804 – 1876).

3) Rahel most likely is referring to Rahel Antonie Friederike Varnhagen (1771 – 1833) a German writer who hosted one of the most prominent salons in Europe during the late-18th and early-19th centuries.

"Palmyra or the Diary of a Parrot" has the same merits and dark sides as "Psyche", except that it was not George Sand who was the inspiration here, but Gresset ¹⁾, the graceful creator of the adventurous parrot Vert-Vert. In this book, Palmyra chats about all kinds of experiences with all kinds of people; witty and biting descriptions alternate with fairy tales and chats about literary objects; Educational fraud, writer's vanity and social arrogance are pilloried with graceful impudence, and although the "ironic" form of the book, the interruption of the narrative by Hoffmannesque "waste pages" does not create a coherent impression, "Palmyra" is one of the most amusing literary pamphlets published at the time.

1) Jean-Baptiste-Louis Gresset (1709 –1777) was a French poet and dramatist, best known for his poem Vert-Vert.

Admittedly, it was just as little autochthonous in the narrow, literary-historical sense as "Psyche", which is why Sternberg tried once again after its publication to create something truly original. At the time, he had still not realized that his talent had its limits in this respect - perhaps because he did not want to realize it, because he tried to postpone the catastrophe of this realization, which had to strip his feudal writing of its glimmer of luxury, for as long as possible. And that is why the year 1838 brought the last and most original attempt to reverse the previous stamp. It was the publication of the fairy tale "Fortunat".

As has already been mentioned, Sternberg had always been fond of fairy tales. His hostility to the nationalism of the young Germany, his relationship with Tieck, his dealings with Kerner and Schwab had only deepened this taste, and so alongside his great novellas he had published a whole series of graceful little fairy and ghost stories, which were provisionally summarized in the "Schiffersagen" ("Sailer's Tales") published by Cotta in 1837. By the time these appeared, he had already outgrown the usual fairy tale style of late Romanticism. His ongoing preoccupation with eighteenth-century literature had led him to Crebillon and Diderot, and it had dawned on him that he

personally had little to do with the fairy tales of his master Tieck. The childish delight in the marvelous and the not-yet-there, which sprouted fantastical blossoms, seemed to him to be artificial, dishonest and off-putting in the long run. In his opinion, what the times demanded, what was much closer to him as a salon man, was the very conscious, satirical and frivolous fairy tale that had flourished in the salons of the Rococo period. Shouldn't it be revived? Wasn't it just missing in a time that (in his imagination) looked as much like the eighteenth century as the present? Thus was born the story of the blond page Fortunat and his three companions, who have to leave the court of Famagusta because they are not sufficiently informed about the tooth of the fairy Urquelle; On the way to the coast, they run into a good-natured old fairy who, as a reward for a service of love, gives them a lucky bag, a magic hat, a rejuvenating potion and a pair of magic glasses that penetrate everything, and now the plot unfolds into a delightful riot of inexhaustible whimsy and melting colours that leads from Cyprus to Provence and from there to the island of the magician Tomogiston, until, after a thousand natural and supernatural adventures, it finally returns to Cyprus, where the young hero ascends the throne with the little Magelone he has won on the way - a charming revival of old French fairy tale dreams, which has at most a few external features in common with the old folk tale of Fortunat and his sons, most recently adapted by Tieck. Here and there, of course, the story slips into ambiguity: there is a rock sofa that has the fatal property of turning boys into girls and girls into boys as soon as they lie down to sleep on it; there is also a princess who has been transformed into a pair of trousers as punishment for her prudery; she regains her actual form when she enters the magic kingdom, but the hero is wearing them and therefore finds himself deprived of the most necessary item of clothing at the moment of her re-transformation, and the poor princess - - . Nonetheless, "Fortunat" is one of the most pleasing products of German fairy tale literature, holding its own as a glittering rarity alongside Tieck's fantasy pieces, and at the same time it represents a high point in Sternberg's work that was not reached again later.

When this story was published by Brockhaus two years after "Galathee", Sternberg may have expected a salvo of the happiest applause; it was his creation and his alone, as he expressly emphasized; "here, I knew, no modern poet, least of all George Sand, could come after me"; now it was up to the critics to decide. And it decided - admittedly in a different sense than he had expected. Here is just one voice - the voice of the Berlin "Gesellschafter", who six years earlier had greeted the appearance of "Zerrissenen" with enthusiastic recognition. What he had to say today was devastating. He had believed, he

explained, that he was entitled to seek a deeper connection to time and conditions; but he hadn't gotten his money's worth. "I almost can't help thinking," he continued after this pedantic statement, "that Sternberg's heyday is already over; unfortunately, the painful nature of this feeling has already lost its novelty; for we have unfortunately already seen this spectacle of comet-like rise and rapid fall, or at least indifferent standstill, in many, and indeed in individual authors not dissimilar to Sternberg in spirit and talent. The most pleasing aspect of the present work would be taken away if we did not regard it as a gift of a light kind, which perhaps only for this reason may have served as a recreational work for the author himself, and after which Sternberg's talent will rise and progress to where he has so far achieved the most excellence, in the modern genre from the upper life of the nobility, which, wavering between culture and tradition, can give his talent an enormous yield.

In short, the critics were ungracious for the first time; where Sternberg had intended progress, they saw a standstill, where he had wanted an upswing, they saw a regression. Instead, they encouraged him to write social novels, stories in the style of "Psyche", which he was reluctant to pen because, in his opinion, they had nothing to do with his actual talent. That was bitter - doubly bitter when you consider that Sternberg had undertaken the attempts of the last few years against his own interests. His financial situation had become unbearable in the meantime; his debts had grown like an avalanche since Stuttgart; his elegant appearance in Weimar, where he was in close contact with the court, and the costly passions he displayed there, had done nothing to change this fate. If he had nevertheless struggled once again for purely artistic laurels, this had testified to an indestructible belief in his ability and in his star. After all, this struggle could not be continued indefinitely. The most obliging friend becomes disgruntled if there is no end in sight to the granting of credit. And so, in the end, Sternberg was forced to lay down his arms. A world of high hopes and expectations must have collapsed on him at the time. His great ambition proved to be a deception. What remained was a grumbling resolve - the decision to keep his pen afloat despite everything and to maintain as decent an average as possible while increasing production. (To be continued.)

* * *

The story of a Cid translation

by Heinz Amelung

In March 1802, Sophie Mereau sent Schiller the following request *): I recently received the news that an adaptation of *Le Cid* by you had been announced in some scholarly publication. However, as I had not seen it myself and could not find out anything definite about it, I decided to ask you myself, dear Hofrath, whether this news was well-founded. For I, too, have long had this work in mind; but although the beginning has already been made, I would have great reservations about continuing it with such a collaborator.

Most respectfully
Sophie Mereau.

Schiller immediately replied**)

My dearest friend, do not let me disturb you in your adaptation of the *Cid*. Of course, among the many ideas one has, I once had the idea of making an attempt to revive this worn-out play, because it rests on an interesting situation, but I have not yet thought of the execution and it costs me nothing to surrender the rights to it. I will be happy to share the idea I had with you, if you can combine it with your plan.

With respect
Yours
Schiller.

To Goethe he reported enthusiastically on March 20, 1802: "Madame Mereau told me that she was working on *Le Cid* by Corneille; we want to gain some influence on this work in order to make an acquisition for the theatre."

*) Published as no. 56 of the "Briefe an Schiller" (Letters to Schiller) by Otto Güntter in Marbacher Schillerbuch. II Tübingen 1907. p. 354.

**) Schiller's letters. Ed. by Fritz Jonas. Stuttgart n.d. VI, 370.

There is no further mention of this matter in the correspondence between Schiller and Goethe; the two poets will have continued to discuss it verbally. This much seems certain, however, that Schiller did not merely influence the

work, but was actually heavily involved in the translation. This is indicated by the many alterations and improvements in the surviving manuscript, which I will soon publish.

The fact that Schiller lent his active support to the poet Sophie Mereau was nothing unusual. He had already taken an interest in her poetic talent when she was still the bride of his colleague and friend, Professor Mereau in Jena. On January 16, 1792, Mereau wrote to Sophie (in a previously unpublished letter) full of enthusiasm: "It is very nice of Schiller that he is anxious to make your first step into literary practice as pleasant as possible." The young, truly talented poetess continued to enjoy Schiller's critical advice and judgment, as he first published a number of her poems in his journals and almanacs. He occasionally remarked to Goethe, who also liked the "little beauty", "Our friend Mereau does indeed have a certain intimacy and sometimes even a dignity of feeling, and I cannot deny her a certain depth. She has merely formed herself in a solitary existence and in a contradiction with the world." Arnim did the right thing when, after Sophia's early death, he published excerpts from the "very fatherly" letters found in her estate, which Schiller had written "to a young poetess", in his "Zeitung für Einsiedler" (Newspaper for Hermits), "not to flaunt a famous name, but to give an instructive example of what criticism can be when it is a pious secret between two people, and not for public consumption."

Following Schiller's detailed advice, Sophie Mereau therefore undertook a thorough revision of her translation, and his judgment certainly often benefited the work. However, a year and a half passed before the play was, in Sophie's opinion, ready for the public. During this time, the poet had only occasionally occupied herself with her work; other plans took up her time, she had moved to Weimar in December 1802, then she had seen and found Clemens Brentano, her ardent admirer, again and had become engaged to him. Before she left Thuringia for good, she also wanted to see her "Cid" locked up and in the right place. We learn more about this from her letter to her bridegroom dated September 14, 1803: "Yesterday I wrote to Schiller about my play; he came to me himself and spent the whole afternoon with me. We read the play and he said that it was to be performed in a few weeks. We took the parts together and were very merry; but he promised me not to mention my name, and that no one but himself and you should know anything about it. But now I have to change some things in it because of the performance, and unfortunately that is a new job for me. I also ask you, as my oracle, to whom I have recourse in all cases, to provide me with a melodious, Spanish, three-syllable female name,

which I can use instead of Chimene, because Schiller does not like it at all. In a long letter dated September 22nd, Brentano replied from Frankfurt: "In the middle of your letter, you have opened a little trope quite hopefully, on which you sizzle broadly with Schiller, God bless the performance of your play, that it may be as good as yours, that it may find many lovers, and yet remain as simple and sweet as you, and that it may be especially devoted to a good heart and refresh it, as you do. Then he gave her eight Spanish women's names to choose from. *)

*) Correspondence between Clemens Brentano and Sophie Mereau. Edited by Heinz Amelung. Leipzig, Insel. Verlag 1908. I 168f. and 189.

Two months later, Sophie Mereau left Weimar without a performance or even a final acceptance of "Cid" at the Weimar Theatre. We do not know whether the matter simply remained undecided, or whether Goethe rejected the play despite Schiller's definite statement. The only certainty is that the translator took her handwriting with her and did not leave it with Schiller or the Theatre. When, shortly after her marriage, she received an invitation from Vienna to collaborate on a planned journal "Artistisch-Litterarische Blätter" (Artistic-Literary Pages) from an old acquaintance, Friedrich Ludwig Lindner, she sent in the "Cid" as well as a novella. But even in this way the work did not reach the public. Then, after three quarters of a year, on September 19, 1804, Lindner had to write the following letter (first published here) in response to an energetic reminder and request:

"It would be necessary, my dear, amiable friend, to tell you long stories in detail, in order to enable you at least somewhat not to consider my silence, which has been observed towards you so far, as a fault of mine; for your displeasure hurts me, all the more as I believe I have excuses for myself, even if I can take no credit for not having taken up the pen to report to you the fate of your submitted writings. The journal did not come to fruition; unexpected obstacles showed us right from the start what we would have to expect in the future, and since some of the difficulties that arose were of such a nature that they could only be overcome after years, the whole undertaking was abandoned for the time being. I therefore tried to sell the Cid to the local Theatre management. But the gentlemen who have to decide on the acceptance of a play are either so swamped with business, or are so much in their habitual slowness, that one can often wait a year and more until one receives a clear decision. However, since I am personally acquainted with some of them, I

should hope to get a decision out of them sooner through frequent prodding and inquiries. Nevertheless, I was put off from one week to the next for several months. In addition, there were various reasons why I had to spend the summer months in the country; I rarely came to the city, and since it is generally difficult to meet people at home in Vienna, I often had the opportunity to make many a futile trip. At last, about two weeks ago, the play was returned to me, with the regret that, notwithstanding the many beauties it contains, it was not considered acceptable for performance on the local stage, which has an audience of its own, especially on account of the slap in the face, which is the main motive of the plot. Since I could have sent you 40 to 50 ducats for it if the tragedy had been performed here, I wanted to wait for the director's decision before I informed you of the details. I only received your last letter of August 20th a few days ago. Since the journal died before it was born, and the Theatre management has no courage, I have once again consulted Schreyvogel about the manuscripts you sent in. As he is in close contact with local booksellers, he is willing to publish your work, but he would like to know your conditions first. If the journal had come to fruition, you could have expected a larger fee for it, as a journal by its very nature can expect a larger sales volume. So please be so kind as to let me know your opinion on this, and also whether, in addition to the *Cyd*, the novella should be printed under a joint title or each separately. In my opinion, the latter could perhaps be published as a New Year's gift. I await your instructions on this and promise the quickest possible reply.

I dare to ask for your kind indulgence and for the continuation of your friendship, which is so dear to me. Live as happily and joyfully as your beautiful mind deserves."

One cannot help smiling when one reads the reasons given by the BurgTheatre management, who were apparently unaware of Corneille's tragedy. Sophie Brentano declined Schreyvogel's publishing offer, although in the meantime she had also failed to find another opportunity. A letter from a bookshop in Altenburg (her home town) dated August 13, 1804 was also found in her estate:

"We had the pleasure of receiving your dear letter of August 6 yesterday, and thank you most sincerely for your kind request, which we are unfortunately unable to make use of, as a 7 to 8 page treatment of the *Cid*, as suitable as it would be for an almanac, would not be suitable for the limited space of an almanac due to its length. On the other hand, short stories, poems

and other essays would be very welcome, and we therefore ask once again for contributions of this kind to our almanac."

The manuscript of the "Cid" returned from Vienna to the hands of the translator, who had now probably lost the desire to make further efforts to publish her play, whether in print or on the stage. Thus a work in whose inner perfection Schiller had taken a lively interest and into which he had instilled at least a touch of his spirit remained hidden in the estate of the poet, who died young. Will it now, after more than a century, find its not undeserved way onto the stage?

* * *

Reform of German spelling

by Dr. Konrad Hentrich

Among the many imperial conferences that the upheaval has brought us is one that is to deal with the reform of German orthography. It differs from the others, most of which have to create a unified system, in that it has to perfect, and in this case simplify, an existing one. This is because the uniform regulation of spelling in Germany and the other German-speaking countries has been in place for a long time.

The first question that arises is whether the reform is necessary. If you compare German spelling with English and French spelling, for example, you immediately notice that the latter lags far behind the development of the language. German does not have spelling and phonetic equations with a discrepancy such as those found in English business = *bisnäss*, delight = *dilait*, dirt = *döet*; French *rol* = *rwa*, *heureusement* = *örösmañ*, *tilleul* = *tijöl*. And if you consider the tenacity with which people in England and France have resisted an approximation of the written form to the phonetic complex, you would have to answer the question in the negative. Even the hope, repeatedly raised by incorrigible optimists, that a simplification of the German language in terms of spelling and even grammatical form and syntax would contribute significantly to its spread must be rejected as in vain. For its spread is not due to its so-called ease or difficulty in phonetics and grammatical structure (assessments that very often do not stand up to objective scrutiny!), but to the political or cultural world standing of its bearers. Roman power made Latin a world language two millennia ago, and British power has made English a world language in recent centuries; political prestige, first and foremost the appreciation of French culture that it generated, then helped the French language to achieve its international social position. The statement by the language scholar Bréal, quoted by Dirr, in the August issue of *Süddeutsche Monatshefte* 1916, "On apprend bien mieux une langue quand on croit monter que quand on croit descendre" ("One learns a language much better when one sees it as rising than when one sees it as falling"). hits the nail on the head. At any rate, it must be admitted that simplification can be somewhat beneficial to the spread of German; however, it will not play a significant role. So it is not external reasons that are pushing for reform. Instead, there are internal reasons that arise from the matter itself!

According to its origin, writing is the optical means of apperception of the sound-image in the case of the impossibility of acoustic transmission, in other words: the visible image (which, in the truest sense, it probably mostly was originally), which evokes in the subject the idea to be transmitted via the sound complex unconsciously associated with practice. This equation of the written image and the sound complex, which is practically to be regarded as a unity, will, however, always be instantaneous after exercise, even if the two diverge as in the English and French words mentioned above; for the written image then always appears as a whole, no longer in its individual parts, the letters - just as the number two, three, four, etc., easily grasped as a totality of comprehensible objects, are, depending on practice, not first understood synthetically, but immediately as a whole, as a unity.. But the greater the difference between the actual sounds and the corresponding written form, the more time and energy is wasted in achieving this state; one must have attended elementary lessons in England to get a real picture of this! Above all, however, and this is the essential point, it is fundamentally incomprehensible why the greatest possible agreement should not be established between things which are identical, even if not substantially so, and which are constantly intended to stand in for one another. From a purely principled point of view, therefore, a reform of German orthography is to be welcomed if phonetic and written German no longer coincide.

Is the latter the case? The layman will generally be surprised when he is told that, even assuming a good High German pronunciation, he writes differently than the sound complex demands. And even linguistically trained people sometimes have unclear ideas about the subject matter. The greatest difficulty lies in the lack of a generally accepted pronunciation of High German. The stage language usually recommended as exemplary in the form established and defined in 1898 and 1908 in joint work by stage experts and linguists has not been able to exert any far-reaching influence beyond the stage, and Siebs, the commissioned author of the "German Stage Pronunciation" containing the unification work, says himself: "It would be foolish and futile to want to demand (in oral performance) for school and life the stage language, which is calculated for long-distance effect and complete unanimity of all speakers and for the representation of strong affects, in all its peculiarity. The reason for the differences within High German can be seen in the partly lively, partly lingering influence of the dialects in timbre, pitch, other sound qualities, strength of accent, duration of sound, not to mention peculiarities in word usage, syntax and stylistics. However, since not all of these factors are of interest for the written image, this diversity loses

significance for our question. Nevertheless, it still remains large. Stein, spielen, stands next to Schtein, schpielen; Tach, Taach next to Tak, Taak for Tag; voiced back palatal fricative next to voiced back palatal place sound in Tage, Klage, Frage; voiced ("soft") lip place sound next to voiceless ("hard") in Bier, Bär, bringen; voiceless weak lip place sound next to voiceless strong breathy one in Pier, Polster, Pastor. This explains why a North German understands Pier, Pein, platt when the Central German means Bier, Bein, Blatt, and correspondingly Kreis, kraus, Kränze when the latter thinks of Greis, Graus, Grenze. Bia, Bää, Vata, Bücha are used by Berliners for Bier, Bär, Vater, Bücher; Bahge, bohgen, Bugen by the people of Cologne for Bahre, bohren, Buren, which the people of Hamburg speak with a strong tongue-r. Wården, wåården, applies next to weerden for werden; Fåård, Pfåård next to Feerd, Pfeedr for Pferd. Ehre next to Aehre for Aehre; leesen next to läåsen for lesen; Nock, Gott, Stoff with an open next to an almost closed o; Hütte, Rücken, müssen with an open next to an almost closed ü. And all of this in good High German pronunciation of the region in question! The reason why misunderstandings are relatively rare despite the differences in sound qualities and despite the homonyms created by them is that the individual word as such does not naturally occur, but is almost always clearly determined by its placement in the train of thought.

It is out of the question that the Conference could consider dealing with cases of the kind described. On the one hand, therefore, it can only be cautioned against overstretching its task. Only sound changes that have become fairly common in good High German in the various language areas (there are, however, also some that have outgrown the dialect only to a very small extent) can be considered for a change in spelling. The conference must be aware of the fact that its task is merely to determine and register, but not to prescribe or give guidelines. Even with this limitation, its task is still extensive, important and meritorious enough. On the other hand, however, it is to be hoped that, where a change is necessary, it will have the courage to act and not make too great a concession to the principle of inertia.

On the face of it, one may establish the principle that one letter suffices for one sound, and that the same letter, as far as this is possible and is not thwarted by considerations of the kind discussed, reproduces the same sound. We have three letters for the one unvoiced dental sound: f, v, ph. Fahrt, fehlen, Fohlen, Fuder fügen, Hafen, rufen – Vater, Vieh, viel, vier, voll, vor - Phase, Philosoph, Topographie, Phrase all have the same f sound. In Middle High German, there was still a qualitative difference between v and f, but this was

already more or less disappearing, depending on the language area, which led to uncertainty in the use of the two letters. High German no longer distinguishes between the two. Ph is an etymological spelling that does not correspond to the sound in either of its two components and, even in its definition by the Latins, was only an approximation of the single-letter Greek letter, its surrogate; strictly speaking, it is therefore not entirely justifiable either from a historical point of view or from the point of view of the actual validity of its elements. Moreover, etymological considerations, which are of interest only to the linguistic connoisseur who can see into the development of words even without special graphic supports, must take a back seat to the practical purpose; when the Italian writes *filosofo*, we need not stop at the philosopher. To summarize: instead of the trinity f, v, ph, we now write f according to the unity of the sound: *Fahrt, Fater, Fase*. In most of Germany, the initial pf can also only be written as one spelling of f. *Ferd, Fahl, flücken* has taken the place of *Pferd, Pfahl, pflücken*. However, since the development does not yet show the uniformity required above, pf is one of the spellings that are best left untouched.

A duplication to two letters of the German alphabet, to k and to z, is represented by c: in *Cöln, Coblenz, Cassel* it is *Platzlaut*, in *Cigarre, Cirkel, Cäcilie Affrikata*. Just as *Cologne, Coblenz, Kassel - Zigarre, Zirkel, Zäzilie* are indeed already written next to it, the ambiguous c could be eliminated from the German alphabet by establishing these spellings, or at least its use could be restricted to foreign names such as *Caesar, Cicero*, although even a *Caesar, Zizero* need not frighten us, since the *Tsar* has not frightened us.

The bipartite qu forms a double spelling of kw, to which it is phonetically quite equivalent: *Quelle, Quast, bequem* are pronounced *Kwelle, Kwast, bekwem*. The original posterior palatal lip sound, which was formed by simultaneous articulation on the velum and the lips, similar to the way labiovelar closure sounds are formed in African languages today, became bipartite through temporal succession of formation, as can be easily determined by ear and objectively by experimental recording. Since both limbs each resulted in a single existing sound, kw, the reason for a special designation no longer applies: qu is to be written kw.

In the same way, the affricate represented in the script by z and tz represents a sound sequence that clearly appears as t + s. *Kauz, Schnauze, schneuzen, kreuzen, Weizen, reizen, Mieze, herzen, Schmerzen, zwicken, zahlen* stands opposite *Glatze, Katze, Metze, wetzen, blitzen, Ritze, Dutzend*,

putzen, Pfüte, Mütze. If there is a historical explanation for the different spelling, it is no longer justified by the phonetic facts today. But it is not just a question of unity instead of duality: the previous spellings should be replaced by a new one that corresponds better to the phonetic picture and has already been given above as ts. Kauts, Schnautse, schneutsen, kreutsen, Weitsen, reitsen, Mietse, hertsen, Schmertsen, Tsahlen, tswicken, Glatse, Katse. Metse, wetsen, blitsen, Ritse, Dutsend, putsen, Pfüte, Mütze would require only a slight change of memory, and that would eliminate z, which has been a pain in German spelling from the very beginning. But if one does not want to part with z, for piety or for practical reasons (it is, so to speak, a sigil for two characters!), then tz would have to be dropped. It cannot be denied that this latter solution also has its advantages. For the sound sequence ts cannot be justified for z in all cases. Just think of the combination nz and lz, which often appear as ns. ls, in which s means the voiceless fricative, i.e. ß. Speak "ganße, Lanße, Sülße, Pilße" and many will find that this spelling reflects their pronunciation far more correctly than "gantse, Lantse, Sültse, Piltse". Given this fact, the decision is not an easy one.

Just like the sound sequence t + s, k + s should also be treated. In today's spelling it appears as chs, e.g. Achse, Flachs, drechseln, Flechse, Deichsel, Weichsel, Leuchse, Wichse, Büchse, Ochse, Fuchs, Wuchs; - as cks, e.g. gacksen, Häcksel, Klecks, gicksen, knicksen, drucksen, mucksen; - as x, e.g. Axt, kraxeln, Hexe, Fex, fix, Nixe, boxen, Jux. Instead of this trinity, the actual sound sequence requires a rendering by ks, so that we would have Akse, Flaks, drekseln, Flekse, Deiksel, Weiksel, Leukse, Wikse, Bülse, Okse, Fuks, Wuks, gaksen, Häksel, kleksen, giksen, kniksen, druksen, muksen, Akst, krakseln, Hekse, Feks, fiks, Nikse, boksen, Juks. However, if you chose z instead of ts, you would have to choose x in parallel.

We allow ourselves a superfluous luxury in Fraktur script with the s-signs, which we differentiate there according to the initial and final sounds, while in Antiqua one letter must and does suffice for one sound. Now, the visual impression of an s at the end of words will initially trigger an inhibition in us, but we will also get used to Haus, Maus, Laus, since Häuser, Mäuse, Läuse are natural to us.

We also have double spellings of vowels that need to be eliminated. The terms ei and ai, as well as ey and ay in proper names, represent four optical images for the same sound sequence, which, however, have their historical justification in the respective origin from old ai or i, or in purely formal

matters, but no longer find support in the facts of today's High German, apart from dialectal exceptions. Of the existing spellings, ai comes closest to the good High German pronunciation. This has an a in the tonally strong element, while the timbre of the tonally weak element varies from a dark i, e to ä. The pronunciation ae is recommended for the stage, i.e. Baen, Staen, klaen, maen - Bein, Stein, klein, mein, and she should do well with it. However, a spelling of ae would be ahead of the development insofar as it has by no means generally progressed to the e sound in the second component. On the contrary, i still asserts itself alongside it without being perceived as dialectal, as is the case with ä or e as a sound carrier. It is therefore advisable to stick with the letter sequence ai for the time being, as it already exists and is also a fairly correct rendition. Gais, Hain, Haifisch, Kaiser, Kai, Lakai, Laie, Mai, Maie, Maid, Mais, Rain, Waidmann are thus all joined by today's ei, and "aine klaine Raiterin in fainem Raitklaid" would soon bother us just as little as "eine kleine Reiterin in feinem Reitleid" would please us today. We would be protected from confusing the now also optical paronyms Haide - landscape and religion bearer, Laib - bread and body, Saite - violin string and direction by the sense of the typeface, just as we are with the corresponding acoustic word equations by that of the sound image.

The decision is more difficult with äü and eu. Neither of these two spellings, which should actually have been äü, eü, represents an equation that is reasonably consistent with the corresponding sound sequence, and the fundamental question must be posed as to whether the reform should abruptly switch to a spelling that has nothing in common with the previous one. For its reproduction on a recording, the phonetic image requires an a nearer to "a" than "o", with the second element ö, e, closer to ü, i. The pronunciation oö is recommended for the stage. Given the regional differences in the good High German pronunciation of the diphthong, there is a great deal of leeway in determining its written pronunciation. However, it is advisable to choose a middle case from the possibilities of au, aö, öü, oi, oö, ve, taking into account the previous written form. This delimitation would give preference to öü, which, as the sound carrier, denotes a more or less open o and, in the rendering of the tonally weak element, offers roughly the image of the second component of the previous spellings äü and eu. However, if, proceeding more slowly, the gulf between the current and the new typeface is not so deep, the choice of aü would be justified, in which "a" would be a muffled sound close to "o", and the optical image would differ only by the rearrangement of the umlaut dots. The two possibilities appear as follows in the optical sentence structure (In Beuron, many bells ring too often today): " In Boüron loütet es

hoüte manchen geschoüten Loüten zu hoüfig " - " In Bäuron läütet es häüte manchen geschäüten Läüten zu häüfig " compared to the current " In Beuron läütet es heute manchen gescheuten Leuten zu häufig ". The third possibility, which would, however, only bring minor progress, would be to eliminate the eu from the au, which could, of course, only be considered a short preliminary stage to further progress along the path indicated.

Since the double ü and y only occur in foreign words, there is hardly any reason for changes.

This would generally eliminate the double spellings, insofar as they are initially considered for the reform. The inconsistency in the use of the letters e and ä has deliberately not been addressed, as a reasonably standardized pronunciation, as mentioned above, has not been established for the e-sounds and so construction would mostly take the place of what has historically been used in different landscapes. However, little would be gained from this. The most likely recommendation would be the consistent spelling of ä before the n consonant, because the open pronunciation of the vowel in this position can be regarded as general on the whole. One would therefore write Ände, Änte, Tränse, änge, danken for today's Ende, Ente, Trense, enge, denken.

In determining the sound designation, we were guided by the desire to make the two sides of the equation between sound and letter coincide as far as possible, i.e. to give the sound the sign that best reveals its timbre or other quality. The question now arises as to whether sounds other than those characterized by double spellings do not also require a change in their reproduction. It is known that the diphthong that we write au is pronounced ao in a large part of Germany, and also the stage pronunciation requires it that way. However, the fact that u is considered to be a tonally weak element alongside o stands in the way of a regulation in this sense, so that no reason for a change can be recognized here any more than with ai compared to the pronunciation ae. We shall refrain from further considerations here.

With the changes discussed, the reform should have essentially and largely done enough in the area of simplification and the approximation of the typeface to the phonetic image with regard to sound qualities. A more in-depth study of the matter easily reveals that going too far must lead to undesirable complications. But there is another important question awaiting a solution by the conference: it will have to decide on the designation of sound duration, of vowel length as opposed to brevity, and I would like to see this as the most important work of the reform. For at the moment there is a confusion here that

has no basis in the historical development of the language or in a logical idea. Bläht stands next to sät, Saal next to kahl, Saat next to Tat, Fahrt next to Art, Schwüle next to Kühle, Lied next to Lid, mahlen next to malen, zieht next to Glied, so that vowel length is either not indicated at all, or by following h, or by doubling the vowel, or by following e, or by following e + h. On the other hand, glatt goes next to hat, mit next to Tritt, hart next to harrt, hast next to haßt, irrt next to wird, so that the shortness of the vowel again sometimes remains unmarked, sometimes is indicated by doubling the following consonant. In place of this colourful inconsistency, the conference is eminently called upon to set the simplest consistency. Fortunately, it need not be at a loss for a solution: it is provided by Dutch. There, long vowels are always characterized by their doubling, short vowels by their singular rendering, so that we would have blüüt, säät, Saal, kaal, Faart, Aart, Schwüüle, Küüle, viil, Liid, maalen, ziit, Gliid opposite glat, hat, mit, Trit, hart, hast, irt, wird, all of which are thus clearly determined as long by double, as short by single rendering.

It is easy to show that this simplest solution is also the most scientifically sound. According to the curves obtained by experimental investigation, each vowel is composed of a number of periods of vibration of the same form which determine it; - in other words, each vowel is the sum of periods which already determine it in their unity; the long vowel differs from the short vowel by the greater number of periods. Thus one remains essentially faithful to the actual proportions if one distinguishes the length from the shortness by spelling the vowel twice. In contrast, any other solution would bear the stamp of arbitrariness and unscientificness. Lengthening by h or e, or even by both at the same time, requires the use of letters that denote a specific sound value, stripped of their actual function in favour of a substantially different one: the same characters are used once for a sound quality and once for the sound quantity, which is not appropriate. The shortening by a following double consonant means another contradiction: instead of shortening the vowel, the consonant is lengthened (the double writing of consonants in the different languages does not originally mean their repetition, but only their longer duration between implosion and explosion), which does not seem to make much sense. A further solution, which would be the introduction of long characters above the vowel, is out of the question from the outset for typographical reasons in view of our umlaut characters; see: hören, Güte, Bär.

If the question of the length designation is solved in the sense meant, the consonant doubling falls by itself. This is also to be welcomed from a

scientific point of view. In modern High German, double consonance generally no longer corresponds to consonant length; it is therefore superfluous. We then get Rücken, Deke, Site, Note, Lapen, Schupen, for Rücken, Decke, Sitte, Rotte, Lappen, Schuppen. Only in one case will we perhaps retain a double consonant in the inlaut: ss. It is necessary to distinguish between the sign for the voiced ("soft") and that for the voiceless ("hard") s sound. In the German script, we have the sign ß for the voiceless s sound, and our Latin script has also created a special type for it, but it is not universal. We must therefore decide in favour of it, or else write double s, deviating from the assumed system.

The shortening of the e before l, r, n in the final syllable as a result of the unaccentedness has generally led to a loss of the e with a simultaneous lengthening of the consonants to syllabic sounds. One says Michl, Handl, Titl, Buckl, Knüppl. Dottr, Büchr, dickr, kleinr; Mottn, singn, Hakn, Lesn, saufn, Lappn. The conference will have to ask itself in all seriousness whether it wants to take this development into account, especially since it can be regarded as fairly general, even though experimental research sometimes reveals a small remnant of the e, not to mention the preservation of the e in the rhythm here. The question of the consideration of assimilations (one says singng, hakng, Lapm for sing, hacken, Lappen), which at the same time becomes topical, could only be decided here, as in general, in a negative sense, because there is neither uniformity nor are characters available for all cases.

An external, but in my opinion the most important task of the reform after the regulation of the length designation should be the decision on the spelling of the initial letters. The historical complication of writing due to the use of upper and lower case letters, which is based on calligraphic practices, should finally be eliminated by writing all words in lower case, as academic journals, especially of the Germanic variety, and linguists have long since done. Everyone, including the educated, would breathe a sigh of relief and place the "Duden" ¹⁾ without tears of farewell in the cupboard of luxury editions, on which the eye can only feast from the outside.

1) The Duden is a dictionary of the Standard High German language, first published by Konrad Duden in 1880.

This briefly outlines the main tasks of the upcoming reform. Some things have been left out, some things have only been hinted at, nothing has been exhausted. But that could not have been the author's intention. The whole must

and should give a generally understandable idea of the problem that the conference has to solve. May it encourage further engagement with it, stimulate discussion and thus contribute to the sprouting of useful, good things from the intended work.

To illustrate the effect of the suggestions made, a piece from Burdach, *Deutsche Renaissance*, p. 12, ¹⁾ is offered at the end as a sample:

1) Carl Ernst Konrad Burdach (1859 - 1936) was a German Germanist and literary scholar.

This passage is found on page 16 of "Deutsche Renaissance" (German Renaissance: Reflections on our future education).

<https://archive.org/details/deutscherenaissa00burd>

"Thus, only the German language of the Middle Ages remains as a rainbow, native, folk-like, naturalized property. It, too, is not free of foreign elements of Latin and French origin in its vocabulary, word formation and syntax. But its core is folkloric. And in this we must agree with Benz and his like-minded peers: the native linguistic power and self-confident linguistic art of the German Middle Ages should play a more important role in the teaching of German in our higher schools than has been the case up to now."

It is due to the strong superiority of the written memory image over the poor awareness of the sense of speech movement that what constitutes simplification and approximation to the actual sounds will initially appear, and not only to the layperson, as complicated and difficult. We are too accustomed to the letter as primary, even though it is secondary to the sound that determines it, to recognize without further ado the more phonetically correct nature of this spelling, its greater simplicity and thus its practical value. The teaching of foreign languages at school has generally freed itself from the letter and placed the sound at its center. The treatment of the mother tongue must not lag behind, it must also be based on the sound. If this happens, the understanding of the views presented here will also become common knowledge.

* * *

Meetings

Objectives for the Imperial School Conference.

I.

On the ministerial decree on history textbooks of Dec. 6, 1919.

It is urgently necessary for the public to learn what concern and alarm the well-known ministerial decree on history textbooks has caused among historians and how they judge it.

The first part of the decree states that the textbooks do not meet the current requirements and that a thorough revision is necessary. Our specialist literature has also been calling for such a revision for years. *) It is obvious that today, since the appearance of the numerous memoirs and the publication of many documents, letters and "revelations" of all kinds, the history since 1890 has to be rewritten. All the proposals for the new editions found their programmatic, generally recognized formulation in the petition prepared by E. Bernheim and submitted to the Minister of Culture on 11. 1. 1920 concerning the decree of 6. 12. 1919, according to which the war and dynastic history should be shortened and the economic, social and intellectual history expanded. Methodological improvements are also necessary, above all a real introduction to historical concepts and approaches. But the history teachers demand that the revision should not be carried out in accordance with the political currents of the day and in the sense of a one-sided view of history, such as the materialist and collectivist one.

*) The remarks by Friedrich Brötzler, „die Lage unserer Geschichtslehrbücher, Vergangenheit und Gegenwart 1919“ (The Situation of Our History Textbooks, Past and Present 1919), p. 223 ff. are excellent.

Unfortunately, the statement on the decree made by Ministerial Director Dr. Jahnke on February 6 in response to Boelitz's question, which is likely to trick the lay public, forebodes evil. In it he says that the great upheaval brings a change in the conception of history and that this is constantly in flux, depending on the times. This means a return to the conception of history of the

Enlightenment, which in fact took its historical standards of value from its own cultural ideal, and a turning away from the genetic one, which judges men and times that have passed away from their "milieu", in the name of the time. Jahnke goes on to say in his statement that the desire for a change in the textbook existed "in wide circles" and that this should be carried out "in accordance with the changed circumstances of the times". Translated into the language of today's factual world, however, "the broad circles" are the parliamentary majority; a revision "in accordance with the changed circumstances" means one in the socialist sense. Consider where this unscientific principle leads. What if, with a different parliamentary majority, the history books have to be revised again "in line with the changed circumstances"! We see that the cornerstone of all scientific and educational activity, "science and its teaching is free", is being overthrown in this way, and history teaching is being robbed of its scientific independence. This is the case in France, for example, where the republican-democratic government seeks support and justification in it; on the one hand, the republican idea is being cultivated in it in a violent and unhistorical manner, on the other hand, it has made the existing clerical-monarchist tendencies subservient to the idea of revenge. In such politically uncertain times as these, we must insist that the revision of textbooks should not be based on changes in contemporary political conditions, but only on the expansion of knowledge through the development of new sources and improved methodology. Otherwise, all pupils will be given the same party glasses from the outset and will be mentally uniformed. However, we want to raise young citizens with an open mind and historical understanding of the present and the political tolerance that arises from this. We bitterly need such a generation!

The second part of the decree, that the old textbooks may no longer be used in the classroom until the new textbooks are published, is hasty and was described as impracticable by the board of the Prussian Philological Association in an audience with the minister on December 29, 1919. It is wrong to publish such regulations for the departments of secondary and lower secondary education together. The guides for elementary schools were indeed often Byzantine in style, whereas the textbooks for secondary schools were thoroughly scientific in character, despite some methodological shortcomings. Even the concession that the pupil may continue to use the book at home does not change the situation. It is comparable to a geography lesson without an atlas. For every old history practitioner rightly recommends that the material discussed should be read out again by the pupils at the end of the lesson so that it is easier for them to memorize; it must be shown to them by page and

paragraph, with superfluous material being bracketed. Otherwise the boy, especially the smaller one, will not find his way through the book at home and, although he needs twice as much time, will still be less successful in his work. So Jahnke's words: "Every good and capable teacher can also teach without a textbook" do not stand up to professional scrutiny. A dictation of material as a substitute, however, is prohibited by the lack of time. And finally, why are the volumes on antiquity and the Middle Ages also excluded from use? It is in the nature of things that under these circumstances publishers and history teachers, who are both in an equally precarious situation, urge the editors of the new books to hurry, which is precisely what must be avoided so that methodologically and academically unfinished works do not enter the book trade.

The scientific and pedagogical interest, both of which should be of primary importance in Schuldingen, therefore require a considerable transitional period during which the old books should continue to be used in the school.

Dr. Bernhard Kumsteller.

II.

A critique of the elementary school system.

Elementary education can only be properly understood as basic education in relation to nursery and kindergarten education. This has not happened so far and therefore there is still much misunderstanding about it. . .

The natural course of education at pre-school age has the appearance of freedom and a lack of rules. It is nevertheless bound to certain guidelines (principles) drawn by nature itself. The child of this age is always and necessarily formed by the whole of perception; in the process it progresses from initially complete indeterminacy to ever greater definiteness of perception; from its self it gradually penetrates further outwards. The principle of totality links this process of formation in all points to the realities of the world and of life; the principle of increasing definiteness directs it towards the individual in and on the objects; the principle of gradual expansion ensures that it has sufficient, but limited, extension for the time being. Under the influence of all three principles, the child becomes at home in its narrower and wider environment, and also at home in its inner world. It gains the ability to perceive and observe, gradually becomes a personality, acquires understanding and the ability to use language; it comes into possession of physical and mental skills. In this way, it approaches the point at which it can fulfill the preconditions for a successful elementary education. They become ready for school.

The question is, first of all, whether it might not be possible and useful to simply continue the natural course of early childhood education. It would also be possible in school teaching to train the child fundamentally on totalities, on things in this sense; it would be possible to continue the endeavour to lead him to ever greater certainty of knowledge; it would also be possible to hold on to the principle of the gradual expansion of the circle of perception. Not only could this be done, but it has often been attempted. Rousseau's Emile is the type of child whose entire education is governed by these principles. Things, experiences are his constant aids. From his father's country house, Emile gradually penetrates further into the world around him. Artificial means of education appear as something foreign, about which as little fuss as possible is made. - Or let us think back to Herbart's followers. ¹⁾ It was they who invented the "linear" educational path and sought to eliminate the "concentric circles", albeit with little success. However, the idea of working together on related

teaching material after it has been covered in class has become downright disastrous. In the end, it was understood that the subject matter should not be separated at all if possible. With a certain enthusiasm, people spoke in this sense of the "salutary idea of concentration" and eagerly set about merging the hitherto separate elements of the educational materials into visual whole, combining individual materials into subject areas and individual subjects into subject groups. For the "elementarists" - actually they should have been called "totalists" - they created the unified teaching of visualization, arithmetic, reading and writing, called it "comprehensive education" and wanted to continue it beyond the first school year, including local history and natural history, preferably until the end of school. What appeared to be an educational element, such as the "bare number" or the "dead letter" or the "pure concept" per se, was causally linked to intellectual "infanticide". Poems had to be enjoyed totaliter, were never allowed to be structured ("chopped up!") and by no means morally exploited. Grammar and orthography, these necessary evils, should preferably not be dealt with at all, but rather learned unconsciously through total use in speech and writing. All in all, the real elementary lessons were replaced by a kindergarten-like continuation with totalities and necessarily spiced up with all kinds of amusing additions. Methodologically, the teaching of the little ones moved from a remarkable earlier art of teaching to methods of copying and craftsmanship. The "formal stages" of teaching were equated with putting on a straitjacket and demanded absolutely free treatment of the material. This usually exhausted itself like a pumping station, in recording and reproduction or, like the unimaginative poetry of modern times, in Im- and Expressionism.

1) Herbartianism is an educational philosophy, movement, and method loosely based on the educational and pedagogical thought of German educator Johann Friedrich Herbart, and influential on American school pedagogy of the late 19th century as the field worked towards a science of education.

The concentration effort was supported by the direction towards "artistic education". This movement, originally from Hamburg, influenced all teaching in such a way that, in the artistic manner, work should only be done with and on the whole. This movement was just as opposed to division, separation, conceptual differentiation and logical training as it was to the gradual processing of subject matter. Absorption and enjoyment was the watchword for them, as was the entire method. The "speaking hand" became the preferred means of expression, while the speaking mouth was given the freedom to express itself "as the beak grows".

The willing recognition of the pursuit of pleasure on the part of young and old children also led to the discovery of joy as a psychological moment that should be part of every educational influence by right. The entire school curriculum, first and foremost that of the "totalists", was now geared towards the arousal of pleasure and joy, thus leading education in the "century of the child" into the path of eudaemonism,¹⁾ which was not the first time in history that a developed cultural nation had met its doom.

1) Eudaemonism - a system of ethics that bases moral value on the likelihood of actions producing happiness.

It is a well-known fact that children, if they are handled incorrectly, are not happy when they learn. And so one could have predicted what finally happened: In Diesterweg's homeland, in the land of schools in general, men (and women!) emerged who fought against the school of learning, who condemned the "old school of learning", which had made us great, to the ground. As always, this led to the natural end of concentration efforts, i.e. to education in the most undoubted whole there is, in material things. This preliminary stage of pedagogical nihilism has been given the name work school. It is more closely associated with manual labour than the name suggests.

1) Friedrich Adolph Wilhelm Diesterweg (1790–1866) was a German educator, thinker, and progressive liberal politician, who campaigned for the secularization of schools.

Is it not true that by working on material things one also attains spiritual education? If we limit ourselves to material qualities and physical actions, it is certainly correct. In relation to spiritual things as such, it is quite incorrect. It is true that a considerable part of our imaginative material can be traced back to the sense of touch, and it is that part which offers us the most reliable points of reference in our dealings with the outside world. However, by far the largest part of our perceptions and ideas belong to the sense of sight, and a very large part also to the sense of hearing. Consequently, our concepts and cognitions, as well as our ideas and imaginative creations, fall for the most part into the realm of the higher senses, which precede the sense of touch, as can be observed in every small child, and are completely independent of the participation of the latter in their achievements. Therefore a blind man is a

poor man, and a deaf-mute is really deprived of much, whereas a man skilled in manual labour, even if he were a master craftsman, is never a spiritually rich man, unless, in addition to his craft, he has occupied himself much with things which, with their materials, belong to the higher senses.

Whoever, in this situation, makes manual labour the center of the entire spiritual education (instead of taking it into consideration as a contributing factor), is forcing the education of young people to slow down, to become external and limited. He does violence to the spiritual workers and in the end harms the manual workers themselves, who receive their most effective help in their work from non-manual things.

Taken as a whole, we are faced with a multiplicity of efforts converging on the intention of continuing education in its entirety, even through school years. These trends have been active long enough and have had sufficient scope that one can reasonably inquire into their fruits. Have we heard of praiseworthy successes, such as the achievements of Pestalozzi's pupils in Ifferten 1) or of Diesterweg's seminary school? - That I would not know. Of course, you wouldn't expect any from the time of the war. But before that there was a great deal of "work" in the spirit of the new ideas. A certain zeal undoubtedly benefited the relevant attempts. Nevertheless, the relevant literature shows nothing of great success or real satisfaction. All the more it shows a suspicious scolding of the old "learning school", the "cramming pedagogues", the intellectual "child murderers". Behind such outpourings, one's own incompetence and the unsuccessfulness of the project being championed can be clearly seen. It is also openly admitted: We cannot achieve our goals. We cannot work according to plan in the new way. The goals have to be set back, individual subjects have to be put on hold completely, the number of lessons has to be increased, the period of elementary education has to be extended from 3 years to 4 years. I have often heard disparaging assessments of the performance of today's elementary schools. Religion is perhaps still at its best if emphasis is placed on knowledge of biblical stories and the acquisition of all kinds of memorization material. In so-called visual instruction, no one really knows any more what should actually be aimed at and what must necessarily be achieved. According to more recent instructions, it seems like a haphazard outdoor experience in which the time wasted bears no relation to the real results. "We can see from this how little teaching has so far contributed to the systematic development of concepts and word meanings." This is Meumann's verdict, and quite rightly so. Numeracy, which used to be so praiseworthy, has been degraded to "arithmetic lessons" and

burdened with "things" to such an extent that there is no end to the complaints about the young children's inability to grasp concepts and other inabilities, but considerable achievements in this subject can hardly be found. At present, there is no longer any real sense of form; mathematical weaknesses are all the more common, not least in secondary schools. Drawing lessons, too, have not made any real progress, but rather significant regression. For a while, it fools children into believing they have a skill that they are far from possessing. Furthermore, the pupils themselves realize their actual inability to draw and drop out as soon as the lessons become optional. The "talking hand" has remained a phrase, and the artistic achievements of today can often only be enjoyed from a distance and with childlike illusionary ability. The teaching of linguistic forms and spelling have to lead a downright miserable existence in our elementary schools. The grammatical and orthographical appearance of many an examination paper, printed transcripts by pupils and published letters from the people compel any unbiased person to make this assumption. Even minor details, such as the highly publicized achievements of some master painters and sign printers in conjunction with the bluntly incorrect use of foreign words, are "deeply revealing". The famous "artistic education" has not even had a beneficial effect in its own field, that of poetry. One does not notice an increased knowledge of German poets in any way, rather the opposite. Not to mention an increase in poetic ability or a purified taste in art. The evidence of the opposite is almost overwhelming.

1) Johann Heinrich Pestalozzi (1746 –1827) was a Swiss pedagogue and educational reformer who exemplified Romanticism in his approach.

2) Ernst Friedrich Wilhelm Meumann (1862–1915) was a German educator, pedagogist and psychologist, the co-founder of experimental pedagogy.

One could cite the "hunger for education", which seems to be more prevalent among the people than in the past, as a favorable factor for the mental state of the masses. Perhaps because even elementary education no longer really satisfies the little ones, i.e. does not bring full clarity to their minds; perhaps also because the general hunger for power and money is mistakenly interpreted as a striving for serious intellectual work.

That leaves the shattering end of the war. I do not know whether other nations, if they had been maltreated as long and outrageously as Germany, would have held out better than this one. I also see enough circumstances that take away the main blame for the collapse of school education and attribute it

to other causes. But it is also no coincidence that 18 years after the beginning of the "century of the child", when the first pupils of the era of pleasure and enjoyment entered our battle lines, our resistance suddenly collapsed and disgraceful conscription and mutiny were brought upon us. To a certain extent, this is a necessity; it is the natural after-effect of a pampered youth on the foolish "old men". It is the pedagogues of pleasure and enjoyment who have educated a youth that wanted freedom, not compulsion, easy enjoyment of existence, no effort or exertion, no sacrifice, that wanted to live, not die. This whole eudaemonistic direction in education has broken the moral backbone of German youth and thus transformed the long remainder of the "century of the child" into what is likely to be the most bitter suffering and distress. I have done this in my book "The Primary School" and can therefore confine myself here to referring to sections O to G of this book.

Hermann Walsemann.

Pedagogy

Deckelmann: "Die Literatur des 19. Jahrhunderts im deutschen Unterricht". - 3rd edition, Berlin, Weidmannsche Buchhandlung. 1919.

About twelve years ago, in a well-done imitation of the usual annual report, the school magazine of a Berlin grammar school published the alleged decree of the provincial school colleague that from now on German lessons could continue beyond Schiller and Goethe to Kleist. Although theory already thought otherwise, at the time it was still bloody irony in practice. Since then, thank goodness, much has changed, and this book can claim no small part in the realization of this change. It was almost a feat to write an entire book of 500 pages dealing exclusively with the literature of the 19th century from the point of view of its utilization for German teaching. The fact that the rich stimuli it offered have fallen on fertile ground is shown by the great success it has enjoyed: it is now in its third, improved edition, which will certainly not be the last.

*) Walsemann, „Die Grundschule als elementare Bildungseinrichtung für alle schulreifen Kinder“. (Primary school as an elementary educational institution for all school-ready children) Schleswig 1919, published by "Neudeutsche Erziehung", Pr. 4 Mk.

In return, Deckelmann promises to continue to look out for fruitful reading, and this is only to be welcomed. Admittedly, he should not allow the volume to swell even in times of better paper supply; without losing the advantage of stimulating richness, some things can be dropped in the future because they have fulfilled their purpose: Keller, Storm, Conrad Ferdinand Meyer have probably gained the esteem to which they are entitled, even in school lessons; more literary-historical remarks (such as those on Gutzkow) can be reserved without harm for the relevant literary histories; yet other parts (Romanticism, especially Novalis) will not be harmed by a limitation of space, because some of them were beyond a really useful school treatment, others should be eliminated as less suitable or valuable (Boy-Ed, Paul Keller). In any case, this would create space for teaching beyond the generation of 1890, with which the book roughly concludes. This is by no means intended to speak for the young and youngest without further ado; but on the other hand, no further statistical surveys are needed to establish that many grammar schools etc. have long since moved beyond this, and if Deckelmann's book were to lead the way or at least provide guidance for this period in the future through good orientation and appropriate treatment of appropriately selected passages and pieces, much would be achieved. For it cannot be overlooked that this preoccupation with the latest literature in private reading, in the lectures of the students or even in the course of study, the understandable inclination to be modern, i.e. to keep up with the times, to show understanding for their demands and wishes, often takes place without detachment and with the wrong perspective and therefore at the same time mercilessly passes judgment on the old, while it merely raises the young *ad astra* for the sake of their novelty. A careful selection of suitable works, such as Paul Ernst's austere drama, Hofmannsthal's rewritings or Hasenclever's "Antigone", which make a critical comparison with the classics and antiquity and an independent opinion gained from one's own insight unavoidable, unquestionably leaves much to be done. In general, the principle of considering the poet under discussion to be the greatest and most important, which in the upper classes is usually replaced by a self-important underestimation due to age, could be regulated in many ways by skillfully drawing on more recent poets and becoming familiar with their endeavours. Wilhelm Schäfer's clear, linguistically beautiful poetry and his "Lebensabriß" (Life-summary), which, for all its brevity, is heavy on content and can offer much even to primates, should be mentioned here as examples on the one hand, and Molo's skillfully crafted but in large parts completely misguided novels on the other. That the biographical attempts, such as those in Schäfer's "Pestalozzi" and in Molo's "Schiller" or in his Friedrich novel, could

be followed by instructive parallel observations on the changing variations in the art of portraiture, both in literature and painting, should only be mentioned in passing. Finally, Expressionism in its essence, development and intention should of course not be ignored, and here samples from the program writings of its spokesmen, such as Edschmidt, Krell (Tribüne Collection, Erich Reiß Publishers), would be very appropriate. A similarly concise but exhaustive comparison of literary Impressionism and Expressionism, as recently presented by Franz Landsberger for painting (Publishers Klinkhardt & Biermann, Leipzig), will hopefully not be lacking for long. This may, however, silence the wishes that this new edition had awakened for further editions.

Walter Heynen.

Literature

Dr. Werner Mahrholz, *German Self-Confessions*. A contribution to the history of self-biography from mysticism to pietism. Furche-Verlag, Berlin 1919. 254 pp.

While we are still waiting for the second volume of Georg Misch's universal-historical history of autobiography, which was promised "in a short time" in 1907 and is supposed to lead up to the 17th century, Mahrholz has given us a book on German self-biography from the mysticism of the 13th century to Pietism in the 18th century that is rich in content despite its small size. An analysis of the bourgeois way of life in the 18th century, which forced itself upon him in a question of Goethe research, led him to the realization that the purest source for this was to be sought in the sum of bourgeois self-biographies, the study of which then led him back with historical compulsion to the time of mysticism. The result was a work that is valuable for the mutual understanding of the development of the bourgeoisie and self-biography in the history of ideas. The development of the bourgeois spirit coincides with the development of self-reflection and individualization, in which Misch already saw the great connection between European autobiographies.

A division of the term bourgeoisie into three terminologically skillful and independent types, which at the same time represent stages of development, gives the whole subject matter and its treatment a clear structure, a consistently clear point of view. Mahrholz distinguishes the lifestyle of the petty bourgeois, with a narrow confines of existence, minimal connection to the world, but all the more profound intimacy of spiritual immersion, from that

of the middle bourgeois, who breaks the confines of familial existence and, with a strong intellectual expansion, is driven by the general interests of all humanity, science, nature, and culture; while the highest flowering of the bourgeois lifestyle, the upper bourgeois, combines the two other conceptions - the spiritual intimacy of the one and the intellectual expansiveness of the other - into a great new order, the delimitation of which is determined by the wilful immersion in the concepts of state and fatherland. . While the highest flowering of the bourgeois lifestyle, the upper bourgeois, combines the two other conceptions—the spiritual intimacy of the one and the intellectual expansiveness of the other—into a great new order, the delimitation of which is determined by the wilful immersion in the concepts of state and fatherland. Mahrholz finds this sequence of stages historically pronounced in the two centuries after the end of the Reformation era, whose upper middle class, which had grown out of the petty-bourgeois religious individualism of the late Middle Ages (high point: Bartholomäus Sastrow), finally collapsed in the Thirty Years' War, in order to then slowly re-form through the broad fertility of Pietism in manifoldly graded lower middle class, rising via psychological liberation (high point: Moritz) - this is the only thing covered in this volume - to the middle and upper middle class mental attitudes, the treatment of which can be expected from a sequel.

Mahrholz is well aware of the danger inherent in such a groundbreaking conceptualization and therefore does not fall into the obvious mistake of constructing the historical representation, as can be found in Kuno Fischer, and forcibly typifying the individuals; rather, the individual autobiographical forms are also clearly brought to bear and elaborated within this framework; an eternal historical-writing task is thus fulfilled. On the other hand, it must be noted that the application of the term "upper middle-class" to the high points of the 16th century - "the stage of upper middle-class individualism has been reached, a historical ring is closed" - does not seem permissible in strict adherence to Mahrholz's own definition, since in the great prelude to individualistic development from the 13th to the 16th century the middle-class stage is completely absent in reality and in this account, and accordingly the postulated synthesis of petty and middle-class attitudes does not take place in any plausible way in the high achievement of the 16th century.¹⁾ The justification of the entire conceptual relationship will only have to be demonstrated in the second volume.

1) Note the terms petty-bourgeois and lower-middle class can be used interchangeably.

This makes his portrayal of petty bourgeois autobiography all the clearer and more convincing; from the mass of material, Mahrholz selects only suitable representatives, whose essence he often captures in felicitous phrases. The well-known significance of Pietism for autobiography and the entire history of ideas often comes to light in a surprising new way; his remarks show how the teleological impact of Pietist biography prepares the developmental understanding of inner events at an early stage, or how his religious self-observation and the moral self-observation of Haller ¹⁾ and Gellert ²⁾ are still a means to an end, but already a precursor to purely psychological analysis, for which self-observation is an end in itself.

1) Albrecht von Haller (1708 –1777) was a Swiss anatomist, physiologist, naturalist, encyclopedist, bibliographer and poet.

2) Christian Fürchtegott Gellert (1715 –1769) was a German poet, one of the forerunners of the golden age of German literature that was ushered in by Gotthold Ephraim Lessing.

Numerous characteristic passages are cited for explanatory purposes, making the work a useful autobiographical reader.

The appreciation of the artistic composition of the self-biography takes a back seat; this can be explained by the whole question of the work; however, it will be allowed to claim more attention in the continuation. More worrying is the fact that Mahrholz approaches the autobiographical sources with little literary-historical criticism; while this may have been acceptable in earlier times, when the genre was certainly not literary in nature, it is now clear that, as the genre has developed, autobiography has inevitably come under the influence of literature, which must be understood before the work can be assigned its place. This is already very much the case in the 18th century, and a man to whom Mahrholz gives the broadest scope in his entire account, Jung Stilling, is proof of this. Mahrholz has partly misjudged and misrepresented this undoubtedly important representative of autobiography by attaching far too much importance to Stilling's "romantic" character. The history of the autobiography's creation, as described in the reviewer's monograph, shows that almost everything in Stilling's early works that appears to be non-pietistic romanticism stems from a tendency that is entirely superficial and openly admitted elsewhere: to make his moral and pious thoughts palatable to his

worldly friends in Strasbourg, to whom he sent his story. Thus it is that a wave of consciously poured out, literarily learned and appropriated elements from Goethe's Strasbourg impregnates the depiction of his youthful life, and even then Goethe had to eliminate large religious passages in order to achieve the effect we see today. There can therefore be no question of "very positive relations to secular literature"; on the contrary, they are far more limited and meagre than Stilling would have us believe. His knowledge of folk songs and fairy tales should not be rated any higher; his enthusiasm for Homer should be taken just as critically. The "problem" that Mahrholz rightly feels in view of this mixture is thus clearly resolved: the true Stilling is that of the last parts of the life story; after deducting these deceptions, all that remains of the Romantic is a strong sensibility, which is sufficiently explained by Pietism and Klopstock ¹⁾ alone and hardly allows Stilling (who incidentally never lived and died in Mannheim, but finally in Karlsruhe) to be classified in the Romantic variety of Pietism.

1) Friedrich Gottlieb Klopstock (1724 –1803) was a German poet. His best known works are the epic poem *Der Messias* ("The Messiah") and the poem *Die Auferstehung* ("The Resurrection"), with the latter set to text in the finale of Gustav Mahler's Symphony No. 2.

Finally, Mahrholz provides a valuable compilation of all his collected autobiographical titles up to the end of the 18th century, which he asks to be supplemented with further references.

G. Stecher.

Theatre

Friedrich Hebbel at the Volksbühne. The Tell of the State Theatre.

The bricklayer's son Friedrich Hebbel created works which, if they were removed from world dramatic literature, would leave a gap that could not be filled. For like every great man, he was a one-off, a one-off in his strength, a one-off in his weakness. But however powerful and compelling his work may be, however profoundly his characters emerge from the depths, his life itself was no less great than this. Indeed, perhaps it was his greatest work, in which the darkest suffering burned like no other poet's life. Anyone who has read his diary pages, this single great heroic song, as Richard M. Meyer has beautifully called it, who knows on what beginnings, hardly to be mentioned, his

economic and artistic existence was built, what cutting insights in his intellectual struggle threatened to freeze him at the "dissecting table of humanity", will find a moving interpretation in the parts of his works where not everything always comes together to form a complete picture, but where an overly probing analysis threatens their artistic life, only to emerge all the more admirable at their peak, bowing in awe before the gigantic will to victory of this great man. However, it can hardly be said that our stages appreciate them. Apart from his "Judith" and "Maria Magdalene", which occasionally appear on the repertoire, they prefer to ignore his "Niebelungen", for example, almost completely, and the last performance of "Herodes and Marianne", for example, was staged about eight years ago. At the Schiller Theatre! But in return, a certain audience, consisting mainly of profiteers and other war casualties, is treated to all the more excellent fare . . . Well, let us rejoice that the Volksbühne (Peoples Theatre) has once again put most other theatres to shame with its repertoire and reminded us of Hebbel's tragedy *Der Ring des Gyges*.¹⁾ And on this occasion, the unfortunate Kandauleß had to put up with a wondrous assessment of his character from the critic of the *Tägliche Rundschau* (Daily Review): "The somewhat soft-headed king, it said, spurns time-honored traditions in order to adorn himself with the superficial trappings of flattering court artists." Poor Kandauleß! You who spoke the words of the sleep of the world, who said

"I know for sure the time will come,
Where everyone thinks like me; what is hidden
in veils, crowns or rusty swords,
that would be eternal - "

But do not worry that you were so cruelly misjudged! You were right when you spurned the "venerable", yet oppressive and rusty prop and commissioned your "flattering court artist" to make you a new, shimmering, lighter crown, a diadem with "all the jewels from the shaft of the mountains and the bottom of the seas," you were in the right, when you exchanged the "venerable" but clumsy and unwieldy sword for a new one that "one can wield when one must", you were right when your beautiful Rhodope, "Aphrodite's sister", was too precious to you not to want to lead her out of eternal twilight into brighter light, so that her miraculous image would not have been created in vain. Certainly, vanity also played a role, but if one desires a treasure only to hide it away like a miser, does not beauty, which hides from the light, commit a sin? Yes, you were right in everything, unhappy king, we all, with the exception of the critic of the *Tägliche Rundschau*, think like you today, and

you only became a sinner against your wife because your desire was too strong to allow yourself to be enslaved any longer. You knew so well that traditions, alas, can so easily become “sloppiness” if they are allowed to exist for too long, that the air does not stand still and the current always flows. But you still stood alone in your world, your pace was too fast for the others, and while they were still asleep, you were already pushing for a new departure. Your sin was your impatience, your doom—not wanting to sleep. How wonderfully you expressed all this in the words:

“- - hey, when someone lies there like that,
 with the normally active arms limp and slack,
 the eyes firmly shut and the mouth
 closed, with the pursed lips
 perhaps still holding a withered rose petal,
 as if it were the greatest treasure: that is perhaps
 also a wondrous picture for one who watches
 and sees. But when he now wishes to come,
 because he, born on a strange star,
 knew nothing of the human need,
 and shout: Here is fruit, here is wine,
 get up and eat and drink! What are you going to do?
 Isn't it true that if you weren't unconsciously
 choking him by grabbing and squeezing him,
 you wanted to say: There are other things besides food and drink!
 and slept peacefully until morning,
 that not one or the other,
 no, all were called anew into existence." - - -

It is well known that Hebbel owes the fable for his tragedy "Gyges and his Ring", in which the most tragic figure is neither Rhodope nor Gyges, but only King Candaules, to the historian Herodotus. The magic ring, however, which is interwoven into the plot and which enables Candaules to give his friend Gyges unnoticed access to his wife's bedchamber so that his ardour can be kindled in her, this magic ring only serves to move the whole into a mystical, fairytale-like sphere and to heighten the poetic brilliance of the poem. The humanity of the characters is not invalidated by it, their passions remain entirely worldly, far removed from all magic, the mysterious ring can only be the impetus, never the cause, and that is why this most perfect tragedy of Hebbel's always remains what every true dramatic poem can only be: a clash of human passions. Admittedly, not everything is of equal value in terms of

poetic animation; here, too, Hebbel the psychologist not infrequently gnaws at the poet, even driving him away completely at times, in order to sensitively emphasize a steep framework of ideas: But the poet only ever allows himself to be banished for moments, he always returns, forms magnificent images, spreads the shivers of the eternal around him and thus remains victorious on the battlefield in the end.

1) The Ring of Gyges is a hypothetical magic ring mentioned by the philosopher Plato in Book 2 of his Republic. It grants its owner the power to become invisible at will.

Staging this work would be a worthwhile task for a modern director of Ludwig Berger's calibre, who unfortunately was lost to the Volksbühne in order to join Reinhardt, where he masterfully staged Strindberg's "Advent" around Christmas time. The Volksbühne entrusted the actor Guido Herzfeld with Hebbel's work, and one can deny that he did not lack care and thoroughness. His hand was not strong enough for more, not creative enough. Moreover, he lacked an essential factor for the solution of his task: a Rhodope, for which Mary Dietrich, to whom she was given, is by no means a suitable force. Initially, her Rhodope - like her Penthesilea - suffered from a monotony of tone coloration, which had a dark melody for the moments of despair, but none for those of turmoil, of horror, which would convey the inexorability of her fate. And when she confesses to the violently reclaimed Gyges: "I must marry you", a passage in which the poet is again driven into a corner by the psychologist, it is pointless to soften the boldness of this final consequence with a soft, almost lamenting performance. No, these words must be spoken with iron determination, rigidity, under the compulsion of a devastating law, if we are not to realize that Hebbel is expecting the utmost from us here. Rigidity, compactness, condensed concentration, that is what Dietrich lacked above all in the creation of her Rhodope. If she was nevertheless not untrue, she only proved anew that she is a good actress. In contrast, Stahl-Nachbaur, Kayßler's younger brother, gave a brilliant demonstration of his artistic abilities, as a critic once aptly described him, in the role of Kandaules, whose mental spirits came vividly to life before our eyes. The verses about the sleep of the world, delivered with the most masterful linguistic technique, sounded like a dark lament from his mouth. But he also knew how to convey the passion of the Lydian king powerfully, even though some of it remained confined to superficial expression; but when, in the great scene with Gyges, in which he praises the beauty of his wife like an enflamed priest, his voice threatened to break with ardor, his image flared up like a blazing torch against

the timeless background. Gyges was a new man, Günther Hardank. Harsh, stern, almost monkish, more Germanic than Hellenic, more man than youth. Genuine emotion resounded in his verses, and even if he may not have been "the Gyges", he was at least "a Gyges", a Gyges with whom every stage can dare to stage a tragedy. The Volksbühne is once again enriched by an actor of distinction. Eugen Eisenlohr played Thoas, staid and loyal, just a little too sedate, Ida Liebisch and Cläre Kollmann as Hero and Lesbia were not quite in the right place.

There is either nothing or only embarrassing things to say about the other Berlin stages. And some of them, which used to be taken seriously, have completely fallen asleep and seem to have forgotten what they were there for. It's also so comfortable when you can rattle off a piece like Schloss Wetterstein 100 times almost without interruption and the box office is having an orgy. So a few words about Jessner's "Tell" at the StaatsTheatre, which, as I still remember, evoked at its première the wheel-spinning scenes of those "persistent" ones who always screech as soon as something dares to deviate from the familiar. However, this is not to say that the new artistic director's scenic re-creation was a complete success, no, it was above all a promise that the former Royal Playhouse, which had hardly been considered a living Theatre after years of artistic desolation, would once again be considered a contemporary stage in the best sense of the word. Leopold Jessner's performance of Tell was thus a positive rapprochement with the spirit of the times on the one hand and an artistic revival of the drama on the other, a reshaping that made us forget what the school had once messed up and spoiled in Schiller's great poem of freedom. Admittedly, the scenery was not always free of violence, reaching to extremes that should have been avoided, such as the fact that the bridge structures of the first scene, behind which the raging lake is to be imagined, are incorporated into Attinghausen's castle hall, which then has a particularly illusion-disturbing effect in the death scene. Such a contraction of the stage set goes too far and only leads to the wish for a completely undecorated play, which we would hardly agree with, especially in Tell. Other things were suggestive, overwhelming, such as the huge mountain shapes, which were only indicated by wrinkled, stretched cloths, but created a thousand times more mountain atmosphere than a decoration with all its chicanery and details. Through this mere foreshadowing of the background, the great idea of freedom, which is "inalienable like the stars themselves", was crystallized all the more brightly, Schiller's words, not always formalized, as we know, but always compelling when it concerns freedom alone, were able to penetrate us all the more buoyantly, unburdened by all trivialities. What failed

with Hamlet in the Großes Schauspielhaus, not only because of the space, was surprisingly successful here, because Shakespeare, the psychologist, cannot be stylized without ignoring a part of him, the most valuable part, but the Schiller of Tell, the designer of types, can be tuned to one tone without suppressing the essential. Of course, if one seeks to conquer poetry from this perspective, if, as Jessner did, one focuses entirely on the great inner thread in order to project it uninterrupted, then this requires actors who congenially devote themselves to this style and resolutely bid farewell to all nuances. That's why this set should not have been a Bassermann, but a Kayssler Tell, but Bassermann wanted to play Tell for once, he was allowed to do so and created a gaping contradiction. For one cannot place an analytical Tell on a synthetic stage, one cannot surround a naturalistic actor with expressionism; that this would happen was clear to anyone who was no stranger to the master player of Solness, who knows that he basically makes no distinction between Ibsen and the classics. So he broke up the words again, clicked his fingers, hummed to himself, in a word, gave a wealth of nuances which, strung together, created an image of captivating humanity, but one that destroyed everything the director had created around him. Bassermann's Tell virtually demanded surroundings, details, individual locality, and precisely the opposite was to be the case. But never the less: an actor of Bassermann's caliber never lets any doubts arise for too long, he simply forces the critic to submit to him, sooner or later, in order to win the game in his own way. Tell's family life, for example, blossomed under his hands into an idyll of vibrant life, and the words "Open the alley" in the apple-shooting scene resounded with a whipped-up masculinity like never before. Bassermann's Tell was not a Schiller play in general, not a Jessner play in particular, but a Bassermann play in all its full power. The other actors, albeit of weaker individuality, were far more under the direction of Jessner, and of these, almost all of whom were good, Ed. von Winterstein's Stauffacher must be mentioned above all: A Hodler figure, strong in every word, united in every movement. Quite the opposite of Bassermann. Then there was Fritz Kortner's Gessler and Karl de Vogt's Melchthal. All in all, it was an evening that one could hardly expect to see so creatively animated in this house in the past.

Hans Orlowius, Berlin.

Theater in der Königgrätzerstraße: F. Wedekind, King Nikolo.

On March 13, 1920, one witnesses this drama of upheaval and purification, this comedy of the king, the beggar and the fool, with one's own feelings. Had he seen it, he would not have written it, nor would he have written it like this. The last word of that generation, that was able to create its life's work in outward peace, is Michael Kramer's ¹⁾ bitter question to the great unknown, is Prospero's "Indipohdi: No one knows" ²⁾; is Wedekind's melancholy: "Such is Life" ("König Nicolo" or "So ist das Leben" (King Nicolo, or Such is Life, 1902)), a foolish crown and a fool's cap heavy with wisdom. Faith probably only grows out of external hardship.

1) Benjamin Franklin Wedekind (1864 –1918) was a German playwright.

2) In chapter 5 of the play "Indipohdi" by Gerhardt Hauptmann, Prospero mentions the phrase "No one knows" to his wife Tehura. His wife then tells him that the word Indipohdi in her language means "No one knows" and that was the name given to their greatest ruler.

<https://www.projekt-gutenberg.org/hauptmag/indipohi/chap006.html>

This work, in many ways Wedekind's purest poetry apart from *Frühlings Erwachen* (Spring Awakening, 1891), seems so clear to us. And yet he feared not being understood and struggles to make comprehensible in words what can only be grasped in form. He writes a prologue that tells us that this king and this fool are yourselves, possibilities of your being, seen in external images. It is Goethe's saying: "An old man is always a King Lear" flattened into the conscious. This work is built with stones from Shakespeare's mighty mountain range. Hamlet, Lear, The Winter's Tale, The Merchant have provided thoughts, figures, scenes. Yet it has become a work of its own and not unworthy. Of course Shakespeare created characters, and we relate to them, Wedekind knows about us and about himself and creates individuals from those parts of his consciousness that live from his spirit, not from his blood. Shakespeare's people are creatures, beings - Wedekind's are only shadows.

It is the boundary of the whole generation. Schnitzler's, Strindberg's, Ibsen's people are all such shadows, cast by the spirit on the surfaces of sensuality. We do not grasp the soul, which stands between light and surface, with sense and feeling, but only understand it from the outlines of its shadow.

One stands apart, a creator, Hauptmann ¹⁾. But he was unable to form a work. He lacks what those have, the spirit, his work often remains a draft, too rarely becomes a building.

1) Gerhart Johann Robert Hauptmann (1862 –1946) was a German dramatist and novelist.

Wedekind puts things together, his work has spirit, order, unity, style. He just never finds the last word. He persuades rather than convinces, his words never coalesce into song – or hardly ever. That is why he leaves so much up to the actor. The actor needs to fill in for him what is missing. He himself was able to do it, but only sometimes. Hartau here in the Königgrätzer Theatre cannot. Certainly a good performance, but good is not enough here. Only the outstanding is enough. Again, it must be said that the direction did not help. Wedekind's work must be performed in a special way. This is ultimately its shortcoming. It doesn't tolerate a broadly human delivery. It is a sign of Wedekind's high artistic sense that he always prepared this stylization to the best of his ability; a high sign of such artistic sense that he demanded the strongest stylization in this, his most soulful piece. He knew his limits. He does not create "soul", he projects it onto the surfaces of sensuality. The more summarized the external image, the more effective the outline, and this outline tolerates and demands great proportions and the strongest profiling.

To grasp Wedekind, you have to understand him, word for word, the meaning of every sentence, every answer, every gesture. The plot is not important enough to interpret the characters from it. Shakespeare can be understood almost without words, Wedekind hardly without a preface.

One scene was good, the tailor's room. Only the king's monstrous outburst, set against these puppets, left a vivid impression. Likewise the wretched church. How could one spoil the haunting impression of the scene with a theatrical roar of wind? Eerily sharp, feature after feature, shadows— then the king, a soul praying for fulfillment, for redemption. Grotesque, bordering on comic, if you like, but different, strange, the voice of the preacher in the desert. The performance deserves our thanks - Wedekind has not yet found his Theatre.

Dr. Kurt Busse.

History

Biographies from Franconia. Published on behalf of the Society for Franconian History by Anton Chroust. Volume 1, Munich and Leipzig, Duncker u. Humblot 1919.

The "Lebensläufe aus Franken" (Biographies from Franconia) as well as the "Badische Biographie" (Baden Biographies), the "Württembergische Nekrolog" (Obituaries from Württemberg), the "Bremischen Biographien des 19. Jahrhunderts" (Bremen Biographies from the 1900's), the "Hessische Biographie" (Hessian Biographies) and the promised "Rheinische Biographische Lexikon" (Rhineland Biographies Lexicon) are intended to supplement and continue the great work of the "Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie" (ADB, General German Biography) in the field of the regional studies. In all such cases, the preparatory work of the "Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie" automatically leads to a temporal limitation of the regional work. The "Fränkischen Lebensläufe" (Franconian Biographies) therefore limit themselves to presenting the biographies of those personalities who were still alive on January 1, 1800. The completion of such a large work, which the editor estimates at 12 volumes, will still take years and so the editor's decision not to publish the individual volumes in strict alphabetical order, but to publish each volume of finished work independently of the others, is to be praised. In this way it has already been possible to present a volume of biographies. For the individual volumes, of course, the alphabetical order has been strictly observed and later "the uniformity and clarity of the entire compilation is to be maintained by means of indexes which show the content of each volume and that of the preceding volumes. After completion of the entire work, a comprehensive index of names will appear, which will contain all the personal names mentioned in an article."

The editor hopes that this work will attract a wider audience of readers with a general interest. He is therefore not only counting on the historians of Franconia or the biographers of the 19th century. The biographies in this first volume certainly justify this hope. Not only because of the surprising wealth of personalities, characters and unique people that Franconia has to offer, and which arouses admiration and deepest sympathy when opened before us in these pages; many of the biographies are works of outstanding creative power and narrative talent. The literary achievement was only made possible by the

freedom with which Chroust set the scholarly task, by the requirement to also portray the external course of life of the personalities to be depicted with "rich colours", to emphasize the personal traits, "which often characterize the nature of the individual better than the most complete enumeration of his works", more strongly than was mostly done in the limitation of the task in the General German Biography. By enriching the literary subject matter in this way, Chroust also hoped to provide evidence of the social, economic and intellectual culture of Franconia in the 19th century, and we are happy to confirm that for the most part he succeeded in these intentions to the most fortunate degree. We have read through the entire 560-page volume in the quiet hours of the night with constant interest.

With these literary intentions, Chroust was also justified in taking a path which, from the point of view of objectivity, is not without its concerns. In order to let the sources of history flow and let life itself speak, he entrusted some biographies to the faithful memory of close relatives; for example, the particularly successful biography of the German unity politician Karl Brater was penned by his highly talented and well-known daughter, Mrs. Agnes Sapper. The Erlangen University professor Dr. Walter Caspari wrote about the pastor and writer Karl Heinrich Caspari, Princess Emma of Castell-Rüdenhausen wrote about Prince Wolfgang of Castell-Rüdenhausen, who died in 1913, Dr. Hermann Frhr. (Baron) of Egloffstein ¹⁾ about the Grand Ducal Saxon Major General Karl August von Egloffstein, Dr. Friedrich Fick about the Professor of Physiology Adolf Fick. Among the total of 66 biographies, I count a further 17 biographies written by relatives of those described. Undoubtedly, in some cases this kinship has clouded the judgment; on the other hand, the advantages for the enrichment of the picture are so great that I can only congratulate the editor on his courage in stripping away all pedantic considerations. To cite an example in which the biographer's kinship has proved to be of the utmost advantage, I mention the excellent biography of the founder of the Bavarian Antiquities Collections in Munich, the director of the National Museum von Hefner-Alteneck and his brilliant son, Werner von Siemens' collaborator, Friedrich von Hefner-Alteneck, which was given to us by the latter's brother-in-law, Privy Court Councillor Professor Dr. Nobert Piloty of the University of Würzburg.

1) The abbreviation Frhr. stands for *freiherrlich* (= baronial).

The biographies of heroes of the Catholic Church are also written by Catholics, those of Protestant believers by Protestants. That goes without saying. If the book is dominated by the Catholic view of the world, this is the natural consequence of the dominant position that the Catholic Church occupies in Franconia. Incidentally, it would be unfair to accuse Catholic biographers of judging their subjects in a way that impairs the truth of the facts. We must, of course, leave it to local historians to comment critically on the individual biographies themselves; we shall confine ourselves to mentioning the special cabinet pieces in this volume, such as the biography of the founder of the Germanic Museum, Hans Baron of Aufsess, written by the first director of the museum, Dr. von Bezold, that of the pencil manufacturer Johann Faber by Dr. Theodor Bitterauf, and that of Baron von Aufsess, written by Dr. von Bezold. Theodor Bitterauf and Baron Lothar von Faber by the same Munich historian, that of the Social Democratic deputy Grillenberger by his friend, the well-known Swabian socialist Wilhelm Blos, also Merkle's works on the princely "miracle worker" Alexander von Hohenlohe-Waldenburg-Schillingsfürst and on the great Catholic church historian Hergenröther, and finally the biography of the brilliant local politician and economic politician, the Nuremberg mayor Scharrer, to whom we owe the first railroad in Germany, written by archive councilor Dr. Mummenhoff in Nuremberg.

Walther Schotte.

Martin Luther. A picture of his life and work. With 384 illustrations, mainly from old sources. By Paul Schreckenbach and Franz Neuber. Second, revised and improved edition. Leipzig, J. J. Weber. 1920.

A popular book about Luther in a new style, in which the illustrations and pictures are equally effective. One can make high expectations on the well-known publisher, and this time too it has proven its old reputation. The printing is impeccable and the illustrations are technically excellent. Only the format of the book, with its uncomfortably long lines of 17 cm, is worthy of further consideration.

Fr. Schreckenbach writes the life of Luther in a simple narrative tone that steers clear of rehashing the controversies. A popular book about the Reformer must ignore some of the difficulties that the son of his time presents to those of us living today and still take new research as its basis. It is important to present the image of a great man in his growth, errors, struggles and victories, but not to show the dogmatist in his view of ecclesiastical problems, to turn

the champion of the faith into a saint himself in long-winded tirades. The author has happily avoided this pitfall. The index, correctly and briefly summarized, provides only lexical data on the individual people and places, but is just right for a popular book.

The arrangement and selection in the main part, the 115-page illustrated supplement, is questionable, and it is striking that the largest collection of Luther pictures in the Prussian State Library has remained unknown to its editor, who has sought to bring together the material from the most diverse sources with diligence and flair. There are certainly technical difficulties in grouping them together, but it is nevertheless important that what belongs together should not be torn apart in this way. The first small Luther picture from 1519 (not 1520) is far separated from a later imitation, the magnificent Cranach engraving, Luther as Junker Jörg,¹⁾ is missing, as is a series of imitations of the Cranach engraving of Luther as a monk. Their combination would have shown how great the demand for such pictures was; Cranach's workshop became a purely artisanal reproducing establishment. As a result, the most truthful portrait of Luther was supplanted by Cranach's masterly hand, depicting the young husband of 1525, and the head of Luther can be found in all reading books as a copy of the thoroughly inartistic Bernigeroth. As a curiosity, it should be mentioned that this picture, discovered a few years ago in a tower alcove in Halle, was reproduced by a widely circulated magazine and celebrated as a particularly valuable find. The whole series, which follows the standing Luther in the family register of 1546, with its additions (study, swan) has likewise been omitted or left out. The deviations from the usual Luther type that various artists allowed themselves in the 17th and 18th centuries, e.g. the man with the short-cropped hair, the reformer as an old woman, as Goethe, etc., should also have been taken into account. Likewise, the newer and most recent art, which after all has made no small contribution to the conception of the great reformer's features, should have been better represented in both paintings and sculpture. We would have preferred to do without various portraits of people from Luther's circle. Finally, a textual presentation of the development of Luther's image would have been very desirable as an explanation. So here's to a new, third edition, which we will welcome with pleasure.

1) "Junker Jörg" was the alias used by Martin Luther during his period of hiding at Wartburg Castle after the Edict of Worms declared him an outlaw.

Technology

A. Riedler: Reality blindness in science and technology.
(published by Springer, Berlin 1919).

To a certain extent, the book is an escape into the public sphere. Among other things, R. gives an account of the Löffler case and then deals with a number of university issues. As far as the case of Prof. Dr. Löffler and the numerous personal remarks are concerned, it is of course impossible to go into them here, but the book also contains a wealth of suggestions and fruitful ideas which, in the interests of our universities, we can only urgently hope do not go unheard. All the more so now that our academically educated engineers finally seem to be realizing that the main burden of economic development will rest on their shoulders and that some reforms at universities are urgently needed precisely because of the increased importance of technology.

Riedler initially rejects the concept of science without presuppositions and correctly notes that true science is and must always be full of presuppositions. The failure to recognize this fact inevitably leads to blindness to reality and forces the creative engineer to relearn for life at a considerable loss of energy and time. In this sense, he deplores the dominance of theorists, without, however, rejecting theory; on the contrary, he calls for a considerable expansion of theoretical training, but with the difference that it should not be pursued for its own sake, but should also be applied to reality. The fact that this does not usually happen is due to the fact that the realistic application of theory is much more difficult than the "pure" theory itself, but also to a gradually historicized and officially cultivated supremacy of theorists. In their quest for "exact" results, theorists take their theorems and coefficients from the "exact" sciences, especially physics, without considering that physicists usually and deliberately try to free themselves as far as possible from interfering constraints and thus also partially from the preconditions of reality. These extremely damaging conditions can only be eliminated by preventing scientific inbreeding by private lecturers and, above all, by attracting to the universities research engineers with real-life experience who manage large companies and combine theoretical knowledge with practical experience and who will never turn to poorly paid lecturing.

After discussing the case of Löffler, N. then turns to the emergence of the technical universities in a section entitled "Becoming a university" and gives

an account of the resistance that the up-and-coming universities in particular had to overcome, and which was often exacerbated by the internal struggle of the departments. For a long time, this rise was hindered rather than promoted by the authorities, particularly with regard to the universities, which were given a special status due to an overestimation of linguistic culture that still prevails to this day. Attempts were made to separate the most important areas of teaching from the colleges and transfer them to the universities in order to deprive the colleges of their academic character and thus the opportunity for advancement. This battle for equal rights was actually only decided by the intervention of the Kaiser in 1900. Today it seems like a tragicomedy that it took years of fighting to secure the right to award doctorates for universities. Riedler then describes the first rise of the universities, which was soon followed by a decline, which he sees above all in the extensive fragmentation of teaching.

In a final section, R. outlines a plan for preventing the impending collapse of the universities. First of all, he again calls for a more realistic teaching approach and a complete reorganization from the bottom to the top, the elimination of the prerogatives of the individual departments and a close integration of science in order to save the precious time and energy of young people. As proof of the unsustainability of the current conditions, he cites the well-known university timetable, which provides for 43 hours per week in the first and second year, and even 50 (!) in the third and fourth, and which is worthy of special mention in the age of the eight-hour day. But even if one regards the eight-hour day as utopian nonsense (especially for a defeated nation), there can be no question of intellectual processing of the subject matter with such an overload.

From a general point of view, it is regrettable that R. has clothed his book in the form of a polemic interspersed with personal moments. In this sense, the extensive interweaving with technical matters is also a certain shortcoming of the book. For although both were of course the author's intention, the book contains many fruitful ideas whose significance goes far beyond the technical. When Riedler outlines his plans for university reform, he also raises the issue of school reform, which is so important for educated people of all social classes. The incomprehensible indignation, which can only be explained by a complete ignorance of the natural sciences and their values for formal intellectual education, which arose at the time when the nine-level secondary schools were placed on an equal footing with the humanistic grammar schools, the slogans such as "useful education" and the like, which are completely

incomprehensible to any expert, have now been silenced thanks to the enlightenment work of important men such as Kerschensteiner and others. But today a new demand is imperiously emerging, which already seems to be gaining acceptance in secondary schools and which may be mentioned here in connection with Riedler's book. If today the natural sciences are still often enough pursued solely for formal reasons, this is a sin against the spirit of our century. Through the wise and limited application of the natural sciences to the technical issues of the present day, at least as much can be achieved in formal intellectual education, with the added advantage that 99% of our educated population would not be faced with technical problems with a level of ignorance that should be considered impossible. It seems self-evident that Schiller and Goethe are "studied" in the last village school, but ask an educated person who Heinrich Hertz, Braun, Slaby, Arco are, and you will rarely get an answer. Schiller and Goethe are probably also more important than wireless telegraphy, with the help of which Germany fought for four years for its moral right to exist. R. concludes very correctly: "The terrible times we have been plunged into compel us to reject all inexperienced planners. Increasingly, "ideologists," "idealists," and "nobodies" are coming to the fore, spouting fine words, people whose entire ideal consists in thoroughly despising reality, whose knowledge they replace with aimless enthusiasm and bold assertions."

A. Heinze.

Political correspondence

March delights.

To throw another stone at Kapp-Lüttwitz ¹⁾ would be to carry owls to Athens. Their act was a sin against the holy spirit, not of the revolution, but of politics. But the heretics' court is a pleasure that we leave without envy to Mr. Müller ²⁾ and Mr. Braun ³⁾ and their press for their demagogic purposes. We will perhaps provide a detailed history of the attempted coup in the next issue, but for now we will content ourselves with a few political observations:

1) The Kapp Putsch, also known as the Kapp-Lüttwitz Putsch, was an abortive coup d'état against the German national government in Berlin on 13 March 1920.

Wolfgang Kapp (1858–1922) was a German conservative and nationalist and political activist.

2) Hermann Müller (1876–1931) was a German Social Democratic (SPD) politician who served as foreign minister (1919–1920) and was twice chancellor of Germany (1920, 1928–1930) during the Weimar Republic.

3) Otto Braun (1872–1955) was a politician of the Social Democratic Party of Germany (SPD) during the Weimar Republic. From 1920 to 1932, with only two brief interruptions, Braun was Minister President of the Free State of Prussia.

1. The government was, is and remains a special-purpose association for the preservation of the supposedly indispensable majority social democracy. Instead of doing the people's business, it does the business of this party. The elections to the Reichstag were to be postponed until the moment most favourable for party politics, and the election of the President was to be entrusted to the safe hands of the parliamentary groups, subject to amendment of the constitution just sworn to. (If the government today denies that the last plan was also its intention, it finds few believers. The new era is even more brazen in its denials than the old; the maxim of this government, to remain silent about its own intentions, but to hint at them as demands of the party in its press, has become known in too many cases, most transparently in Müller's policy towards Soviet Russia).

2) The government's understanding of the feelings of the opposition and its ability to deal with minorities are even poorer than those of the government

of the old authoritarian state ever were. The most moderate of the German Nationalists, Count Posadowŝky ¹⁾ and Dr. Dühringer, ²⁾ drew President Ebert's attention - before their party's corresponding interpellation - to the danger that a postponement of the elections could entail. To no avail! Before they became "high traitors," Lüttwitz ³⁾ and his officers demanded—perhaps in bad faith, which made it all the more necessary to respond diplomatically—the most obvious thing in the world: the replacement of some of the most incompetent and uneducated members of the cabinet with so-called specialist ministers, i.e., individuals qualified by education and profession for leading positions, and the abandonment of a policy that would inevitably lead us into the arms of Soviet Russia and into a new, absolutely hopeless war against the West; (in connection with this request was General Lüttwitz's demand that he be allowed to keep a politically unpopular general whom he could not do without as an expert), and finally that the administration be cleansed of all suspicion of corruption, which, in the wake of the famous Sklar affair, ⁴⁾ has contaminated our entire public life. Answer: General Lüttwitz will be dismissed immediately. Pressure creates counter-pressure! A truth that the government does not seem to be aware of; instead, it proceeds according to the principle of treating opposition that can be mitigated or even persuaded through negotiation and concessions without endangering the state brutally, while opposition that is truly anarchic and should be fought with weapons should be handled with kid gloves and negotiations.

1) Arthur Adolf, Count of Posadowsky-Wehner, Baron of Postelwitz (1845–1932) was a German conservative statesman.

2) Adelbert Düringer , also: Adalbert Düringer (1855–1924) was a German lawyer and politician (NLP, DNVP, DVP).

3) Walther Karl Friedrich Ernst Emil Freiherr von Lüttwitz (1859–1942) was a German general who fought in World War I.

4) The famous Sklar affair, might be referring to the Sklarek scandal, although modern references state that this scandal started in 1926. Skláře is also the name of several places in the Czech Republic. Otherwise I cannot say what this is referring to.

3. Lies have been told in the war, in the revolution; under the monarchy, under the republic; under Kapp, under Müller, but never before have so many lies been told as in the parliamentary debates on the Kapp affair. The most remarkable examples of demagoguery are probably the solemn obituaries for those who fell in March 1920. Mr. Braun "remembers with reverence those

who gave their lives in the struggle against the traitors and for the protection of the Republic"; I ask Mr. Braun to name names and to prove that the dead of these names gave their lives in the struggle against Kapp and his power. There will always be innocent people who fall in street fighting, but those who died in those March days through resistance of any kind did not fall as opponents of the Kapp government, but as opponents of the military power, as opponents of the state in general, as Bolsheviks, as murderers and looters. Such, for example, were the dead from the battle for the Schöneberg ¹⁾ town hall, namely those who fell when the German army Regiment 5 had to evacuate the garrison whose lives were threatened. Nevertheless, they were buried with the same mendacious phrases. But nobody cared about the murdered officers. The same Minister-President Braun's words about the mark of Cain, the fratricide that he wants to see on the foreheads of the right-wing parties, are nothing but the worst and, to top it off, comical demagoguery. The same parliamentary government that participates in the party struggle in this way from the government bench of parliament, on the other hand, demands respect for the authority of its party government. Müller, Braun and their cohorts have no concept of democracy or parliamentarianism.

1) Schöneberg is a locality of Berlin.

4. The government, whose members would have been morally obliged to oppose the Kapp-Lüttwitz coup d'état with personal violence and risk their own lives in the process, did the wiser and safer thing and fled to Stuttgart; apart from that, it did nothing to settle the Kapp-Lüttwitz incident. It was not Müller, Bauer and their comrades who saved democracy and the state, but the lack of energy, incompetence and disunity of the counter-revolutionaries on the one hand, and the negotiating skills of Minister Schiffer on the other. The counter-revolution was not defeated by the general strike; it is a falsification of history to claim that the general strike broke the power of Kapp-Lüttwitz. A government in military power over Berlin, the Reichsbank and the Reichsdruckerei need not capitulate to the general strike, but can continue the struggle, even if the final outcome is of course uncertain. But revolutionaries who pay for a revolution out of their own pockets, who are divided among themselves, who do not know what they want and how they should go about it, are finished the moment they start. The immense danger that threatened our fatherland through the general strike conjured up by the government, and which became acute the moment Kapp and Lüttwitz resigned, was averted by

Schiffer through his agreements with the unions. In return, he was let go, just as the two socialist ministers of the old governments, Noske ¹⁾ and Heine, ²⁾ who had intellect, courage and character, were sacrificed to the masses.

1) Gustav Noske (1868–1946) was a German politician of the Social Democratic Party (SPD). He served as the first Minister of Defence (Reichswehrminister) of the Weimar Republic between 1919 and 1920. Noske was known for using army and paramilitary forces to suppress the socialist/communist uprisings of 1919.

2) Wolfgang Heine (1861–1944) was a German lawyer and politician (SPD), long-time member of the Reichstag, Minister President of the Free State of Anhalt and Prussian State Minister.

5. Unfortunately, the movement is not finished with the fact that the most incompetent Foreign Minister we have ever had has been made Chancellor. In the meantime, the government is trembling - and we with it - that the communist workers in the Ruhr district are blowing up the shafts with dynamite. Perhaps this hour will pass mercifully, but what will become of it? With a government that has no positive program, neither in the economy nor in social policy, a government that thinks nothing other than aggressive party politics against the bourgeois groups on the right, a government that is sawing off the bench on which it sits by insulting and interfering with the army, a government which, according to the strangely identical words of both Mr. Müller and Mr. Braun, "does not allow itself to be frightened by Bolshevism", does not see the danger of Soviet Russia, but wants to throw itself into its arms without knowledge, cluelessly and apolitically! What is to become?

1 April 1820.

Walther Schotte.

Notices and Previews

Romain Rolland, Henri Barbusse, Fritz v. Unruh. Four lectures by Walther Küchler. Published by Würzburg G. m. b. H. 1919.

Clear, captivating analyses of Rolland's "Johann Christoph", "Fire" and "The Clarity of Barbusse" and "The Sacrifice" and "The Sex of Unrest" lead to an understanding of this group of poets, whose unmistakable common tendency, despite their widely divergent thematic treatises, is the lofty task of international reconciliation. Küchler has followed their trains of thought and

endeavours with a fine understanding and has been able to remove a number of important obstacles that stood in the way of fully grasping Rolland in particular. Above all, the well-defined outline of Johann Christoph Krafft's character, in which traits of Beethoven, Hugo Wolff and also Richard Wagner can be found, will contribute much to a peaceful enjoyment of the many successful passages in this great work. As a scholar of French literature, Küchler is no mere eulogist of the French poets, whom he would follow through thick and thin, when he openly acknowledges the power of Barbusse's powerful war poetry, calling it the "Iliad of our time," when he then finds new merits in the next novel by this French author, namely "clarity," and highlighting them, he is by no means blind to their one-sidedness, and he rejects Barbusse's carefully developed and sharply dissected program, which seeks to preserve the fatherland without acknowledging the idea of the fatherland, because he knows that the science of humanity is not geometry. – Küchler rightly sensed the spirit of the approaching revolution in Unruh's poems; it is a pity that he did not refer in this context, if not to Latzko, then at least to Leonhard Frank's "Der Mensch ist gut" ("Man is good"), but also to his earlier poems, in order to illuminate how the revolution was already negatively prefigured in them in the form of renitence and obstruction, and it only needed war to derive the positive demands from this.

Even so, this slim volume remains an important and interesting contribution to the psychology of our literature of wars and at war, which has secured an outstanding place for itself through its clarity and well-founded argumentation.

Clemens Brentano, ¹⁾ Collected Works.

The beautiful edition, which had been published in ten volumes by Georg Müller, Munich, without any definite information about its fate, has now been taken over by Ullstein and will continue to appear in its Propyläen publishing house - hopefully without any changes in format or layout. The management is in the hands of Heinz Amelung, who had already taken a significant part in the edition in the past and who is now asking all owners of Brentano manuscripts and letters to kindly make them available temporarily. Please send the originals by insured letter to Essen (Ruhr), Herbertstraße 13.

1) Clemens Wenzeslaus Brentano (also Klemens; pseudonym: Clemens Maria Brentano, 1778–1842) was a German poet and novelist, and a major figure of German Romanticism.

1st vol – <https://archive.org/details/clemensbrentano01brengoog>

2nd vol – <https://diglib.uibk.ac.at/download/pdf/4532778.pdf>

Books and writings received by the editorial office:

(The editor reserves the right to comment or discuss).

- Scharrelmann, With.** - Valleys of youth. Leipzig 1919. Quelle & Meyer. 5 m.
- Schauwecker, Franz.** - Im Todesrachen, The German soul in the world war. Halle 1919, Diekmann.
- Scheurer, Dr. Adolf.** - Armed merchant ships in the world war. Berlin 1919, Jul. Springer. 2.80 M.
- Schmidt, Erich, K.** - Die Cänzerin. Berlin 1919 Oesterheld &. Lie. 7 M.
- Schmidt, Dr. Hans W.** Wie schreibe ich für die Jugend. Berlin, Kribe. 2 M.
- Schmitt, Jos.** - State and Church. Freiburg i. B. 1919, Herder. 6 M.
- Schmoller, Gust.** - Grundriss der allgemeinen Volkswirtschaftslehre, Vol. I/II. Munich and Leipzig 1919. Duncker & Humblot. 52 M. and 25% C surcharge
- Schnee, Dr. Heinr.** - Deutsch-Ostafrika im Weltkrieg. Leipzig, Quelle & Meyer. 15 M.
- Schubert, Franz.** - Letters and writings, edited by O. E. Deutsch. Munich 1919, 6th Müller. 6 M.
- Schumacher, Dr. Fritz.** The small apartment (Willenshaft und Bildung, vol. 145). Leipzig 1919. Quelle & Meyer. 3 M.
- Selle, Götz v.** - Zur Reorganization des höheren Bildungswesens, Schriften der deutschen Studentenschaft, Heft 1.
- Shaw, Bernard.** - Three Plays for Puritans (Tauchnitz Ed. Vol. 4531. Leipzig, B. Tauchnitz. 4 M.
- Siebe, Josephine** - The heroes of Spatenbühl. Berlin, C. Flemming & C. T. Wiskott. Spahn, Martin. - Ellak-Lothringen. Berlin 1919 Ulstein.
- Spahn, Martin.** — Ellak-Lothringen. Berlin 1919 Ulstein.
- Steinberg, Jul** Die Praxis des Bank- und Börsenwesens (Willenshaft und Bildung, vol. 139). 2nd edition. Leipzig 1919, Quelle & Meyer. 1.50 M.
- Thoma.** - Poems. Constance 1919, Reuß & Itia. 3 M.
- Tourtoulon, Pierre de** - Les principes philosophiques de l'histoire du droit. Paris 1919. pavot, 12 fr.
- Treitschke, Heinrich v** Die Gründung des Deutschen Zollvereins (Voigtländers Quellenbücher, vol. 62). Leipzig. R. Voigtländer. 1.50 M.
- Waetzold, Dr. Wilh.** - Deutsche Malerei seit 1870. Leipzig 1919. Quelle & Meyer. 3 M
- Wallersee, Marie, Freiin v.** - My past. Berlin, publisher Es werde Licht. 2.50 M.
- Wandrey, Theodor Fontane.** Munich 1919. C. H. Beck. Geb. 15 M.

Watson, IH. B. Marriott. - The Excelsior (Tauchnitz E. Vol. 4530). Leipzig, B. Tauchnitz. 4 M.

Wehrmann, Martin. - Geschichte von Pommern I. Gotha 1919. F. A. Perthes. 12 M.

Wilson, Woodrow. - Reflections of an American (revised by H. Winand). Munich 1919. 6. Müller.

Wolzendorff, Dr. Kurt. - German thinking on international law. Munich 1919.

Musarion Verlag. 4.50 M.-" - Die Lüge des Völk.rrechts. Leipzig. Der Neue Geist Verlag. 6 M.

Wrede. - Rhenish Folklore. Leipzig. Quelle & Meyer. 10 M.

Responsible for the editorial report: Dr. Heinrich Otto Melsner, Charlottenburg.

Published by Georg Stilke, Berlin NW, Dorotheenstr. 66/67.

Printed by J. S. Preuß, Buchdruckerei, Berlin S., Dresdener Str. 43.